
GRAMMATICAL DISSERTATIONS.

828. c 7

81

13

DISSERTATIONS

Grammatical and Philological.

BY

PETER WALKDEN FOGG.

[N.B. These Dissertations are contained in the second volume of *Elementa Anglicana*; but are thus printed separately to accommodate such as may wish to peruse them without the rest of the work; *particularly to serve as lessons for pupils*, to whose hands the Key cannot with propriety be committed.]

----- Fari, ut possit, quæ sentiat. HORACE.

STOCKPORT;

PRINTED, FOR THE AUTHOR, BY J. CLARKE.

and sold by

T. KNOTT, NO. 47, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON,
and by the Booksellers in general.

1796.

13



ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

PREFACE.

THE Grammar which I have offered to the public should have consisted of three volumes; the first nearly what it now is, the second comprizing the key and notes, the third composed of a number of rules and examples subservient to composition, together with these dissertations. The first and third volumes would then have been proper for learners in their different states of proficiency; the second would have been entirely for the purpose of reference. Not fixing on this plan at first, and having unfortunately straitened myself by the terms of subscription, the work is necessarily published in two unequal volumes. The additional exercises in composition, not strictly grammatical, and therefore not originally promised, together with two dissertations on composition and criticism, are as yet unprinted; though (according to my ideas in January last) they are quite prepared for the press. What farther augmentations they may receive, and what encouragement I may have to bring them to light, cannot at present be precisely ascertained. In my own practice I find the manuscript of considerable utility.

The following attempts to investigate the Theory of the greatest part of the grammatical rules in a plain and popular way, appeared so adapted for pupils in the higher classes, that a few copies have been struck off to be sold separately. Their excellencies, if they possess any, the reader will discover: one of their defects I freely acknowledge. Remarks properly falling under some of the heads had been anticipated in the Notes following the Key, and to avoid repetition are wanting here. It

is hoped however that enough is left to satisfy the mind on the most important topics. Should that public favour, which I have toiled to deserve, encourage the republication of the whole work, every thing apparently misplaced shall be removed, and three volumes formed, that shall aim at least, to traverse the whole circle of philology, with as large an extent as common seminaries require.

Stockport,
September 16th, 1796.



GRAMMATICAL DISSERTATIONS.

DISSERTATION I.

On UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR and the HISTORY of LANGUAGE.

I very early found it, or thought I found it, impossible to make many steps in the search after truth and the nature of human understanding, of good and evil, of right and wrong, without well considering the nature of language.

Diversions of Purley.

THE art which forms the subject of these essays, comprehends far more than its name* strictly signifies. It teaches the manner in which oral utterance expresses ideas, and written characters oral utterance : the theory of signification, of sound, and of writing.

God designed man for society : in bestowing rational faculties, he had instamped his own image on the human mind : society required a communication of those ideas, that knowledge which formed the reason of man : language was the means of communication devised by the Maker to serve both from himself to man, and from one man to another. The disposition inherent in man to give names to objects, was, immediately before his entrance into society, prompted, according to the venerable relation of the Hebrews, by an extraordinary presentation of all the different kinds of animals over which he bore sway, in such order and such numbers as best served to inform his intellect and complete his vocabulary. His memory, young and vigorous, preserved the different sounds with their associated ideas. At first, the names of the more vociferous animals he might derive from their own cry.—The more silent tribes would be named partly from accidental

* Grammar, derived from the Greek word *gramma*, a letter.

noises made on their first approach, and partly from composition, enlargement, or augmentation of more obvious words according to some simple analogy. The recent language would be completed by names, invented by the same process, for a few of those objects that needed no removal: the grand scenes of nature open to his most superficial gaze; the neighbouring and necessary parts of the vegetable kingdom; and his own sensations and affections: the sky, the earth, the sun; trees, fruits, flowers, water, sleep, awaking, hearing, seeing, tasting, harmony, and whatever his confined wants and undepraved appetites would most frequently bring to mind.

Intercourse with the Creator would greatly enrich and rectify the discourse of the creature, before the introduction of the first woman, whose gentle disposition and mature faculties would induce and enable her to acquire the whole by imitation, sooner than can well be conceived.

To this original stock, the transactions and discoveries of every day would add fresh words. The principal source whence these would be derived was composition of terms already in use, most likely with some change in the tone, and an unequal emphasis. But, as, without previous consultation, the capricious modes of derivation must vary with different men, names would be affixed to the same object very different in families that had little intercourse; and, by degrees, while the radical parts of all speech would be the same, dialects would abound very various in the words that express less primary and less essential objects and relations. In some time, merriment, mistake, the love of harmonious sound, and the pride of refinement would, in many instances, change the antient terms themselves, and form languages radically and totally disagreeing.

The above considerations make it exceedingly probable that the whole world was not of one speech at the universal deluge. In the course of seventeen centuries considerable alterations must have taken place. We read, 'tis true, that at the building of the tower in Shinar, they all spoke the same language. But that appears to be in the age of the flood, or in some of the more early succeeding ones. Now, give the number of tongues spoken at the deluge as great as you please, it is evident, that this calamity, by destroying the whole human race, except one family of eight persons, would totally extirpate every language but one, and leave the situation of things in this respect, as at the beginning of the world; only the preserved family would have a greater variety of words, and would possess many terms originating in reflexion and ratiocination. The builders of

Babel, then, being descendants of Noah, would speak his more copious language, a little altered and enlarged by the lapse of years after the flood, and just branching afresh into separate dialects; and may we not allow that, without any infusion of new languages, the various uses of one term, or the various terms for one idea might be forgotten by the leaders of different tribes; the varying new-coined names for the utensils and materials of building (artificial objects and derived names) might be tenaciously adhered to by the opposite parties, and this concurring with other powerful causes, might scatter them very widely asunder? Hence, in a short time, their speech would shoot into numerous ramifications; an event which would otherwise have been brought about by a more slow, gradual, and imperceptible change.

However this may be, we are not warranted in supposing, either that a difference in language is solely owing to divine interference, or that the various tongues now spoken had their origin at the confusion in Shinar. The former idea is contradicted by the nature of things as before explained; the latter by the existing authentic history of languages that have been produced, matured, resigned to decay, and succeeded by others since that period. The natural revolutions of language seem to be from novelty to elegance, from elegance to plainness, from plainness to vulgarity; then to disuse, then to oblivion. Parts of the present English, French, and other modern tongues have undergone these changes, which are slow and gradual. The accidental alterations, which are more violent and speedy, are by conquest, irruption, and intermixture of foreign nations. Such was the origin of the European tongues in general.—Books have a great tendency both to perfect and preserve language. Several that were once spoken by whole countries, now exist solely in books, or the conversation of the learned; and these are called dead languages, as the Hebrew, the Syriac, the Greek, the Latin. Such as continue in general use in any nation have the reverse epithet, of living.

It is probable that every language in the world hath had its origin from a parent language spoken by the first men. What forms a language is properly a system or collection of words, standing for certain ideas by the consent of a number of people. Of these, there are likewise dialects, which differ from each other in the meaning of a few words only, but their pronunciation and inflexion of the same words vary. These may be compared to sprouts from the old stock, adhering to it, but ready, upon separation, to become distinct stocks themselves. The Greeks had several dialects all considered as pure; but this

character is in most countries, allowed, for obvious reasons, to that of the court only.

The character of the antient languages will be, as is proved by the above considerations, and by comparison,——a great imitation of the imitable and obvious qualities of things in the very words themselves;* a forcible utterance necessarily attended with much gesture, and great variety of tones: they would contain few words, and those principally names of sensible objects; whence, and from the lively disposition of nations little cultivated; they would abound with figures, or words used differently from their proper signification. Beside all this, the order in which their words were placed was neither so certain nor so logical, as will more fully appear in the sequel. The modern languages, having been formed from the other by men who had reflected on the properties of speech, and wished for ease and precision, will be found their opposites in the qualities before enumerated; will have their meaning arbitrarily imposed, their pronunciation not energetic but easy, their words numerous, so as to have more than one for some ideas; they will be suited to the purposes of cool enquiry, rather than passionate declamation, and the order of them will be natural and plain†.

To all languages, this must be a common property, that each word or indivisible part of speech, expresses some idea, or real, or imagined combination of ideas. The most natural words, which do not require the intellectual faculty at all (and therefore have been, by some, denied the rank of words) are exclamations or interjective particles. These seem to differ in man from brutes, only as the superiority of his organs. The most common of them as *oh, eigh, ah*, are very easily pronounced, and are not indebted for their meaning to consent or compact, but are native cries expressive of strong affections.

The next in order of necessity and plainness are names: these are words employed to recal the idea of substances. It is a truth soon apprehended by the human intellect; and the foundation of reasoning, that among the objects of perception those of one class are permanent, or alike at different times; and of these, that many are similar one to another. Hence the two ideas (or perhaps judgements or beliefs) of substances and species. One of the first efforts of speech, in a race of infants abandoned to the nurture of wild beasts, would be to adapt

* *Blair's Rhetoric, Lect. vi.*

† *As to other properties of language, and the comparison of them singly, what of this our plan admits will fall in best in the character of the English.*

words to these objects, applying the same to all of one kind.— This we have traced above in the history of Adam. This we find exemplified in the first lisplings of our own children.*

But there are certain appearances which do not seem permanent, nor independent, but adhere to, or proceed from what we call substances. Such are the sounds and motions of animals, and the different states of beings in general. Words expressing these, are what we now term verbs: these verbs or assertives must have existed as a sort distinct from substantives, almost from the first period of vocal expression. These too are the necessary distinctions of words, founded on real differences of things.— Interjections are natural, but not necessary, as where speech is well known, their import may be expressed in names and verbs.† With the two latter, it is, no doubt, possible, to relate all that can be related in the most perfect language, though not with equal convenience. They would at first exist as simple words without those inflexions which they afterwards obtained; and though I have called the second class assertives, it is not with strict propriety, as the force of assertion would not be in the word itself, but in the junction between such words and names.

Here then we have a plain, easy analysis of a natural language, composed of three parts only, names, verbs, interjections; one of them not necessary to speech. They are all simple unvaried terms; their use is evident, and their difference plain. But, in process of time, a wish to add convenience, and polish intro-

* Children give the names, *dad* and *mam*, to their own parents first, and then to all men and women whom they address. The same by the names of *uncle*, *nurse*, &c. and different species of animals, but they gradually correct themselves. They always learn several names before any verb.

† This statement of the essential nature of language is taken from the system of John Horne Tooke, Esq. in his *Epea Pteroenta*, or *Diversions of Purley*, with which I entirely agree as to the necessary parts of speech, and the antient practice of it; but may perhaps testify my dissent from some less material particulars hereafter. Of the above, I have thought on a mode of proof, a practical one, obliquely suggested by an acquaintance of mine, which does not seem to have struck the learned, ingenious, and very humorous author. This is exhibited in the following version of the hundred and seventeenth Psalm into that style or mode of expression.

"Praise Jehovah, Nations: praise Jehovah, People. Cause:—
"Kindness belonging Jehovah exceeds; approaching men.—Add:
"truth belonging Jehovah endures ages. Praise Jehovah".

duced those difficult and abstruse distinctions which make grammar a hard study* ;—though, perhaps, not so hard in itself, as in the works of some of its professors.

DISSERTATION II.

ARTIFICIAL IMPROVEMENTS IN SPEECH.

Interiora velut sacri hujus adeptibus, apparebit multa rerum subtilitas.

Quintil. i.

The necessity would soon be discovered of distinguishing one individual from the rest of its species; Abel, for instance, from other men. Hence proper names. Desire of brevity would occasion the ellipsis of names recently expressed; but this in some instances would produce obscurity; and hence, I suppose, the invention of general representative names or pronouns of the third person. From the same principle, and from that of modesty, and sometimes of mystery, in one case; and of deference, and sometimes of ignorance, in the other; the speaker antiently pointed to himself, and pointed or moved towards the person whom he addressed, without naming. But words to express these *circumstantial substances* were soon found convenient. These being of the first and second person, completed that class of names styled pronouns; the most general of all in their possible application, and the most particular in their actual employment.†

Longer time would introduce that species of substantive which resembles a prosopopoeia in Rhetoric, when the object is not a substance actual or believed, but treated as such by the license of speech; as when we say, *A thought* came into my mind—in- stead of—I began to think‡. Substances of this class are called abstract names.§

Men having observed the existence of species, or that things not identical were very similar, and finding the number of individuals apparently infinite, began to use definitives, terms

* “*There are few sciences in which a deeper, or more refined Logic is employed than in Grammar*”.

Blair, Rhetoric, Lect. viii.

† *Blair, Lect. iv.* ‡ *See note on art. 249.*

§ *These, by some grammarians, are made a class distinct from the proper and common; but in practical grammar may be well included in the latter.*

placed before names of species capable of distinguishing and marking individuals without the help of proper names.*

By a most remarkable abbreviation were formed prepositions and conjunctions. These now independent parts of speech are only intimations or hints of the relations of objects, and of the train of thought into which we wish to direct those that we address: consequently we must seek for their origin in the two radical and native divisions of words, the verb and the name.—This abbreviation appears not to have taken place till after the introduction of many languages now remaining; as the particles in most of them may be traced to verbs and names either in the languages themselves or the parent tongues.† When the word, whether name or verb, was found to occur very frequently, and to form a parenthetic term, or nearly so, first the pronunciation was a little lowered, then it was changed, and frequently the word in all other senses was disused. Thus the verb *except*, (leave or take out) having often expressed a desire that the hearer would leave out something in forming his idea of a subject, is now uttered in a lower tone, and considered as a different part of speech; and the verb *give* may be shewn, in the same way, and by dropping a consonant, to be the etymon of the conjunction *if*; although many would be astonished at the supposition that this word expresses anything of action.

By additions signifying what are termed modes and times of verbs‡ several circumstances were included in one word, which had been either disregarded or expressed by a circumlocution. The same may be observed of the casual terminations.¶ These are not by any means necessary properties or accidents of language, but useful improvements. Most probably these endings were originally independent words, which, being of smaller emphasis, at length coalesced with the principal words, not without considerable abbreviations. Some languages, as the Hebrew, express most of these minute differences by parts prefixed to the words: and this circumstance confirms the hypothesis.

Perhaps what are now called adjectives would be found, could we trace them to their sources, to proceed uniformly either from the participial mode of the verb, or the possessive case of the substantive.

By various methods, principally by obsolete cases, and by joining some other term expressing likeness, the phrases denoting circumstances of actions coalesced into one word, or became

* *That, this, the, yon, &c.*

† *This is illustrated and evinced by examples in the twenty-first dissertation.* ‡ *Diff. xviii, xix.* ¶ *Diff. xvi.*

one by ellipsis, and were termed adverbs from their use.*

I have thought it probable that all verbs were originally what we term neuter, requiring another word to direct to the object; and that this term, being frequently dropt by ellipsis, was at length disused with several words, thence called active or transitive verbs. For example, a certain author inveighs against the phrase, "she scolds me": he would have it "she scolds at me", and observes that we might as well say "the dog barks me: I add, so we might did custom sanction it;—a striking proof of this hypothesis.

Doubtless one may account, by similar reasoning, for what are termed passive verbs in other languages; for the different degrees of adjectives; and for whatever, in speech, may be differently but more circuitously expressed.

As the substantive and verb are the only necessary words, they were originally in close and constant union with each other. If a person said *an ox*, he must add *loves*, *grazes*, *comes*, or assign some other act or state incident to the animal; and he could not say *walks*, *flies*, without joining *man*, *bird* or some other subject capable of the act specified. Thus these two words would form perpetual pairs. Discourses thus framed would be as certain as possible: no more would be required in this way of speaking than to have one word constantly appropriated to one idea: yet it would run to such a length as not only to weary but even confound. The sense, though infallibly certain, would not be intuitively clear. Hence the various abbreviations serving to the formation of sentences, by which more sense can be uttered with a less expence of sound and of time. But after the invention of these, the pairs of the noun and verb would still be sought for by the mind; and whether several subjects were directed to be considered as concurring to one action by words now termed conjunctions; or one subject was described by its relation to others, expressed by prepositions connecting those others, or adjectives including them; or whether the action of the verb was connected with some object, with or without connecting word; or lastly, the subject was declared to do several different acts denoted by conjunctions between the verbs, the mind would naturally rest when the mate or fellow term had been uttered, and not before. The collection of words between each of these resting places is what we now term a sentence. There must be some contrivance to shew among several substantives, in one of these, which sustains which character. The first and plainest is that of order: namely, that those come first that are first in the

* *Dissertation xxi.*

transaction; and that each should follow, immediately, or as near as may be, that with which it is immediately connected.— But because this cannot always be determined with certainty; also because the warm speaker, eager to name that with which he is most affected, is apt to break any set form before he is aware; and yet must name one object but once in precisely the same state and circumstance; and further, because the logical order is often harsh and unmusical; terminations or other alterations are invented, by which it may be determined, with tolerable confidence, what words are related, though far disjoined in the sentence. Thus, the pronoun or personal name *I* denotes a certain substance which acts: *me* denotes the very same substance acted upon; or else connected with another substance or with some act by a preposition; and this, whether it comes after or before, near to, or distant from the other word. As, “*I* love virtue. Virtue love *I*, and still will love. Proud oppressors despise *me*. *Me* proud oppressors despise”. This contrivance of language is a very refined one, and adds much to its beauty, its harmony, its force; and, if too great liberties be avoided, to its perspicuity and precision; but at the same time augments the difficulty of attaining a command of style.*

A knowledge of these artificial improvements makes what is commonly known by the name of grammar. Here may be seen the distinction between a language and the grammar of that language. A language is a collection of words, as before described.† Its grammar, in the vulgar sense, is the way in which it varies its words to express abbreviations, and point out connections; the most usual rules by which its sentences are formed; and the method of pronouncing and spelling its words. Beside these, signification is an important part in universal grammar, and merits in this work, at least, a few brief observations.

DISSERTATION III.

On the signification of Words. On Sound and Writing.

Signification, in the modern languages is arbitrary; not in-

* *We shall find in the sequel, that most other kinds of words are as susceptible of these alterations as personal names. We may remark too that grammatical accidents are as various, in different languages, as the signification of words.*

† *Dissertation i, p. 137.*

deed subject to alteration at the caprice of individuals, but regulated by the sanction of communities.* The clear proof of this is, that the terms imposed by the framers of different languages on the same objects, differ more, in many instances, than the names of the greatest opposites in the same language.†

This, however, is not to be extended to the denial of a certain fitness in some terms to express their associated meanings.—Many of them (for example, *bifs*, *buzz*, and *crack* in English) indicate not very remotely what they represent. Words of this sort may be found in every language, but their effect is most perceptible in those of the simplest construction.

Neither are we to conclude, from the above premises, that any name hath been affixed without some reason.‡ Indeed the maxim that every thing which had a beginning had likewise a cause, would confute this notion. Words, in their first origin, must have some foundation in things; though in many instances no doubt a slight one: in their secondary application they must be derived from other words at first thus founded. But this derivation would be attended with so great mutilation or change, that (to vary the figure) after several generations, the progenitor could by no means be recognised in the offspring.

Signification, notwithstanding the reiterated complaints of the circumstance, and the denial of it by others || even of great authority, is still ambiguous; different ideas being expressed by the same word. This happens through derivatives from different languages accidentally concurring in sound; from the figurative license; and sometimes from inattention. Philologers should aim at removing this difficulty, by disusing the word in every sense but one, and substituting terms to express the other meanings; terms already in use if practicable; if not, foreign words most likely, every way considered, to meet general approbation. In the mean time dictionaries with all their imperfections of distinguishing without differences, confounding distinctions, and omitting significations, must be carefully con-

* Originally a lion might have been called a lamb; or a chicken, a vulture.

† Agnus differs more from lamb than leo does; basileus is perhaps farther from the sound of king than from that of cobler; and la mort has as little resemblance to death as la vie.

‡ Invasit multos perversa quaedam opinio, seu barbaries potius, in Grammatica et sermone Latina nullas esse causas, nullamque penitus inquirendam esse rationem: quo figmento nihil quicquam vidi ineptius, nihilque potest excogitari putidius. Sanctii Minerva.

|| Sanctii Minerva, lib. iv, cap. 14.

sulted. Those that exhibit a variety of examples are most eligible, because in them the above errors may be corrected by a comparison of instances; whereas much time might be fruitlessly wasted by each individual collecting these for himself.

Language will become more perfect when it has been determined what is a separate substance deserving of a name; or a distinct act or state attended with sufficient circumstances to be worthy of a distinct term for expressing it. Mistakes too arise in discoursing from what has been before hinted at: * that actions are by the fancy viewed as substantives, substances as qualities, and expressions applied accordingly.†

Proceed we now to glance at a different part of universal grammar, namely sound.

The sounds employed in expressing ideas are confined to those proceeding from the mouth, in uttering which, man makes use of the simple voice issuing from the lungs, modulated by the larynx, the jaws contracted or extended, the tongue, the palate, the teeth, the lips, and the nose. The number of distinct noises formable by these organs is in itself finite, and when a proper deduction is made for those that are rejected on account of harshness, or omitted through ignorance of their power, it will be contracted to a very moderate limit. But a few primitive sounds may suffice; because, in the variety afforded by combination, matter is found, more than sufficient for expressing whatever man can have occasion to communicate.

The principal distinctions in articulate sounds, are that into the voice, slightly impeded by different openings of the jaws, and the voice stopped, and emitted with a different modification, by the outer organs; a more specific distinction according to the different parts employed in forming the sounds; and some inferior ones, according to the mixture of voice and breath, capacity of prolongation, and other nicer circumstances. These, however it will be better to treat of fully in another place.†

We shall have finished our general sketch of universal Grammar; or the science of those things which belong to languages in common, when we have considered a little the nature of writing, which is preserving by characters, the notion of the

* *Diff. ii.* † *Terms begin to be applied with great precision in the arts and sciences that concern visible objects, especially in botany and chemistry, and since the publication of Dr. Darwin's great work, are likely to be so applied in the useful art of medicine. What an essential service would that philosopher render, who could imitate this in theology, morals, metaphysics, or legislation!* † *Dis. v.*

sounds of discourse, so as to communicate at any distance of time, and place the same ideas.

The first attempt at writing, according to the best authorities, had no connection with speech. The imitative faculty in man, early prompted him to delineate the forms of visible objects; which enlarged his power of communication. This was afterwards improved into the hieroglyphical art, which was performed by pictures, emblematical of abstract ideas.*

Simple arbitrary marks, the signs of things, were the third stage of writing. Such are the Chinese characters at this day; and hence, can be read by nations of different speech, just as Europeans of every varying language, can read numbers when expressed by the Arabic notation.

But the various disadvantages experienced in these methods, could only be remedied by the discovery of a mode of copying the sounds of speech, and transmitting them just as they had been uttered.† This however had its several degrees of perfection; probably at first it was an alphabet of syllables, still retained in some countries; then it proceeded to one of a few sounds made to answer by grammatical rules to the words spoken: this alphabet has been gradually improved by the addition of charac-

* *A circle stood for eternity, because it has neither beginning nor end: feet standing on water for impossibility, because they cannot stand so.*

† *The inventor of letters is not certainly known. Many learned men seem convinced, that he lived before Moses. Thus much is nearly certain, from that great legislator's history, that either the Egyptians were in his time possessed of this capital art; or it was communicated to him by the Deity, when the written tables were committed to his care: the Almighty thus blessing the world with two of his greatest favours at one time.*

From Phenicia, a part near to Judea, prophane history informs us, that letters were brought into Europe by Cadmus. They were then in number sixteen, having name, shape, and sound pretty conformable to characters in the Hebrew alphabet. It is probable the Greeks first wrote the Cadmean alphabet from the right hand towards the left, like the Hebrew; that afterwards for convenience of beginning one line where the hand was upon ending another they changed it to the alternate method from right to left, and from left to right, which they called Boustrophedon, from its resemblance to the course of oxen plowing. This, they afterwards changed for the very method used at this day. Most of our letters are known to have been derived from those of the Greeks.

ters, but, as we shall soon prove, has never attained perfection; of which, however, it is as capable as most inventions.

As the perfection of speech requires one certain and fixed word for each idea, so that of writing demands one character to be uniformly applied to each primary sound. But, as in that, different irregular inflexions, ambiguities, and exceptions have taken place; so, in this, the various schemes have abounded with characters denoting different sounds, and different characters for the same sound. Some simple sounds have had no single letters to mark them; some letters at the same time have been wholly superfluous. Last of all, letters in many words have been, and still are, continued in writing when their expression is laid aside. Thus what, if founded on scientific principles, would have been the clearest subject in the world, is now that intricate, knotty, perplexed, yet necessary branch of learning——orthography.

DISSERTATION IV.

History and Character of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

We Britons in our time have been remarkable borrowers.

Harris, Hermes.

Est [scil. lingua Anglicana] enim et verborum et elegantiarum fatis abunde plena, et (si libet) ad luxuriam copiosa.

Wallis, prefatio

The English tongue is neither the same that was antiently spoken in this island, nor derived from it. An instance of that violent change described in a preceding dissertation, the original language was driven by the northern invaders into the mountains of Wales, where it still subsists.

Straitened in their own territory, and allured by the fertile fields and fair prospects of Albion, the Saxons long meditated, and about the year of Christ 680, totally effected the conquest of their British confederates.* In consequence the language of the Saxons prevailed. This was a dialect of the Teutonic or Gothic, distinct from the Celtic. It was the foundation of the present English, but is generally referred to, as it was spoken before the Norman conquest, by the title of the Anglo-Saxon.†

I think it incumbent on me to give the public a few short specimens of this language, from its pure state at the early periods of

* *They assisted the Britons against the Picts.*

† *This language, which still subsists in books, (principally in manuscripts) is well worthy the acquisition of all lovers of correctness in speech, but especially of those who would be masters of the theory*

the Saxon heptarchy, to its assuming nearly its present form immediately after the reformation.*

A very few verses will suffice from the Saxon Poem *Calendarium seu Menologium Poeticum* (the Calendar or Poetical description of the Months) a manuscript in the Cotton Library : they are from the conclusion of the Poem, which is much more wild than the rest. But the uninteresting tales of saints which fill the months seemed less worthy of quotation.

“ Kyning sceal rice healdi
 Keastra beoth feorran gefyne.
 Or thanc enta geweorc
 Tha the on thisse eorðan syndon.
 Wraetlic weall stana geweorc.
 Wind byth on lyfte swiftuſt.
 Thunar byth thragum hludaſt.
 Drymmas ſyndan Criſtes myccle.
 Wyrd byth ſwithoſt.
 Winter bið cealdost”.†

After Alſred’s time, beſide the common cauſes of change, we may reckon the influence of learning, which would introduce Greek and Latin words, firſt among the literati, but eventually

of our Language. Its alphabet differs from ours in the ſmall d, e, f, g, i, r, s, t, w ; and in the capital A, C, E, G, H, M, W ; and it has two different characters of either ſize ſtanding for th. It wants the j, q, and v ; and has arbitrary characters for æc (and) thaet (that) and oththe (or). It has two points or ſtops ; a ſingle dot for the imperfect ſenſe, and three in a triangular poſition for the perfect. It is remarkable for confounding and ſuppreſſing letters, which ſeems it never to have been highly poliſhed, and in which it agrees with the fluctuating Old Engliſh. Its grammatical inflexions for caſes, degrees, modes, and times are in general conſonant to the preſent Engliſh ; but are more numerous, and frequently leſs definite or precise in their application. What are called particles in Engliſh, the ſubſtantive verb, and an innumerable multitude of other words correſpond to the parental Saxon. See Hicke’s *Theſaurus*, the *Anglo-Saxon and Maſſo-Gothic grammar in the beginning*.

* Thoſe who wiſh to ſee larger, may conſult *Johnson’s dictionary in quarto*.

† TRANSLATION. A King will govern his kingdom. Cities are the ingenious works of Princes, who paſs their lives on this earth, the walls are made of hewn ſtone, they are beheld from afar. The wind in the ſky is moſt ſwift : the craſh of thunder is moſt loud. Great is the majeſty of Chriſt. Fate is moſt powerful. The winter quarter is moſt cold.

among the people. Translations, of which there were several,* would much augment this influx of exotics. The Danes, abiding for years, and frequently exercising the government, must cause an intermixture of many of their terms; sprouts 'tis allowed from the same root. The tongue, by some means appears very different, before the Norman conquest, as in the following translation of part of Mary's song.

"Min sawel maersfath Drihten.

And min gast geblissude on Gode minum Haelende.

Fortham the he gereah his thinene eadmodnesse, sothlice heonun forth me eadige secgath ealle cneoressa.

Fortham the me mycele thing dide se the mihtig is, and his nama is halig.

And his mildheortnesse of cneoreffe on cneoreffe hine ondraedendum".†

In the following piece, the sense is yet plainer, and they give us no contemptible idea of the Saxon muse. The Poem is in the Bodleian library, and consists of one hundred and ninety-one stanzas, of which the Treasury of northern literature contains a small extract, whence I have borrowed a smaller still.

"i. Ic am elder thanne ic wer
A wintre and ec a lore
Ic ealdi more thanne ic dede
Mi wit oghte to bi more.

xiii. Se thaet hine selue uorget
Uor wiue other uor childe
He sal comen on euel stede
Bute god him bi mild.

xv. Ne hopie wif to hire were
Ne were to his wiue
Bi for him selue eurich man
Kaere wile he bieth alive.

xxxvi. Heuene and erthe he ouersiet
His eghen bith fulbriht
Sunne and mone and alle sterren
Bieth thiestre on his lihte.

xxxix. Heuene and erthe and all that is
Biloken is on his honde
He deth all thaet his wille is
On sea and ec on londe".

* There is one of the *Consolations of Boethius* by King Alfred himself; and the works of Bede were soon turned into his vernacular speech. † See *Luke* i, 46—50.

At the Norman conquest the French began to be spoken at court, and used in registering the laws; hence many words are derived to our speech, some from the Gallicized Latin of that time,* and some from the Franco-Thoetic. Yet the general current of the Anglo-Saxon appears not to have been affected by this tide, till almost a century after the above era. So insensibly indeed do the alterations take place, that there is no certain epoch of the commencement of the proper English. The pieces, whence are taken the two following short quotations of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, are of the class denominated by Hickes, Semisaxon.

“Tha was the eorl underfangen aet Wincestre and aet Lunden mid micel wurtscipe and all diden him manred, and fuoren the pais to halden and hit ward sone fuithe god pais sua thaet neure was here. Tha was the king strengere thanne he aeuert her was ac te eorl ferde over sae ac all folc him luvede for he dide god justife ac makede pais”.

Saxon Chronicle.

“Kyng Alfred was the wyfast kyng that long was byuore
Vor they me segge the laws beth in worre tyme volore
Nas it nogt so hiis daye vor they he in worre were,
Lawes he made rygtuollere and strengore than er were
Clerc he was god ynou and gut as me telleth me,
He was more than ten ger old ar he couthe ys abece;
Ac ys gode mother ofte small gyftes hym tok
Vor to byleue other ple, and loky on ys boke”.

Robert of Gloucester.

The following extract from Trevisa's version of a Latin work† seems doubly adapted for our purpose: It falls in the next century to the last example, and it relates to our speech at that period, and a more antient one.

“As it is knowe how meny maner peple beeth in this Lond. There beeth also so many dyvers longages and tonges. Nothelss Walsche men and Scotts that beeth nought medled with other nations, holdeth wel nyh hir firste longage and speche; but yif the Scottes that were sometime confederat and woned with the Pictes drawe somewhat after hir speche but the Flemynges, that woneth in the weste side of Wales, haveth left her strange speche and speketh Saxon-lyche now. Also Englishe men, they had from the bygynnyng the maner speche, Northerne, Sowtherne and Middelspeche in the middel of the Londe,

* Particularly martial and culinary terms; the peasants retained their old ones.

† *Higdeni Polychronici.* See Hickes's *Thesaurus*, vol. i. *Praef.* page xvii.

as they come of thre manner peple of Germania. Notheles by comyxton and mellynge, first with Danes and afterward with Normans, in meny the contrary Langage is apayred,* and som useth strong wlaßerynge,† chiteryng,‡ hartynge,|| and gartynge grißbayting.§ This apayring of the burthe of the tonge cometh of tweie thinges, oon is for children in scole agent the usage and maner of all other nations beeth compelled for to leve hire owne Langage, and for to construe hir lessons, and here thynges in Frenche.—All the langage of the Northumbers, and specialliche at York, is so scharp, flitting and frotyng,¶ and unschape, that we Southerne men may that langage unnethe understonde. I trow, that it is bycause that they beeth nyh to strange men and nations, that spekeh strongliche, and also bycause that the kinges of Engeland woneth alwey fer from that cuntrey.

——God be thonked of all his nedes this translation is ended in a thorßday the eygtenthe day of avril, the yere of our Lord a thousand thre hondred four score and sevene. The tenthe yere of King Richard the second after the Conquest of Engelande. The year of my lordes age Sire Thomas of Berkley, that made me make thys translation fyve and thrytty.”

A few of the celebrated Chaucer's verses will be the best accompaniment of the last extract. His works are accessible to most of those who will be strongly desirous of a further acquaintance; I have the pleasure of transcribing one fine and exquisitely moral little poem.

“ Gode counsaile of Chaucer.

Flie fro the prese and dwell with sothfastnesse,
Suffise unto the gode though it be small,
For horde hath hate, and climbyng tikilnesse,
Prece hath envie, and wele it brent oer all,
Savour no more then the behovin shall,
Rede well thyself, that othir folke canst rede,
And trouthe the shall deliver it is no drede.

Panie the not eche crokid to redresse,
In trust of her that tournith as a balle,
Grete rest standith in litil businesse,
Beware also to spurne again a nalle,
Strive not as doith a crocke with a walle,
Demith thy self that demist othir's dede,
And trouthe the shall deliver it is no drede”.

* Corrupted. † Muttering. ‡ Blustering. || Drolling. § Disagreeable mumbling among the teeth. ¶ Roaring.

That the is sent receve in buxomenesse,
 The wrafflyng of this worlde askith a fall,
 Here is no home, here is but wildirnesse,
 Forthe pilgrim, forthe o best out of thy stall,
 Loke up on high, and thanke thy God of all,
 Weivith thy luste and let thy ghost the lede,
 And trouthe the shall delivir, it is no drede".

The Saxon character is here totally laid aside; few persons, that are conversant with our best authors, from the reformation downwards, will find much difficulty in collecting the general sense of these passages.

In the next century we are more at a loss for examples, but if the following short extract from Fortescue, a great lawyer in the reign of Henry the Sixth, be not singular, there had now acceded a sufficient number of exotic terms. "Whan Mankynd was more *mansuete*, and better *disposyd* to *Vertue*, Grete *Communalities*, as was the Feliship, that came into this Lond with Brute, wylling to be *unyed* of many parts must needs have an Heed; than they chose the same Brute to be their Heed and Kyng. And they, and he upon this *Incorporation* and *Institution*, and onying of themself into a Realme, *ordeynynd* the same Realme, so to be rulyd and *justyfied* by such Lawys, as they al would *assent* unto".

In the writings of Sir Thomas More, of the sixteenth century, we see a great approximation to the present style, in the words, and in the phrases, which yet are more formal in transiſion, connexion, and measure. It least resembles in orthography. From the peculiar disposition of the author, the words are neither obsolete nor exotic, but no doubt similar to the best conversation of his cotemporaries; while the manner in other respects shews a vigorous mind in full exercise, not without some elegancies drawn from classic fountains*.

"Lamentacion of the deth of quene Elisabeth, mother to
 King Henry the eight.

O ye, that put your trust and confidence,
 In worldly ioy and frayle prosperite,
 That so lyue here, as ye should neuer hence,
 Remember death and loke here uppon me,
 Ensaumple I thynke there may no better be.
 Yourselfe wotte well, that in this realme was I,
 Your quene but late; and lo now here I lye.

* See part of a letter from this great man, vol. i. ex. 697, 860.

Was I not borne of olde worthy linage?
 Was not my mother queene, my father kyng?
 Was I not a kinges fere in marriage?
 Had I not plenty of every pleasaunt thing?
 Mercifull God, this is a straunge reckenyng:
 Rycheffe, honour, welth, and auncestry,
 Hath me forsaken, and lo now here I ly.

The muse of the gallant and unfortunate Surrey, used the same language, but in a more poetical manner.

“The hydden traynes I know, and secreet snares of love,
 How soone a loke will prynte a thoughte that never may remove.
 The slypper state I knowe, the sodein turnes from welthe,
 The doubtfull hope, the certain wooe, and sure despaired helthe”.

From this time the art of printing and its beneficial consequences, freedom of thought, and general information, have contributed to the publication, wide dispersion, and preservation of multitudes of works; and by gradually bringing the middle and higher ranks throughout the kingdom to agree in their mode of serious speaking; and by encouraging in the British youth, an attention to their own tongue, as a necessary branch of learning, have in a good measure perfected and fixed what was defective and fluctuating. Some blemishes “remain, and will remain”. Slight alterations will take place. What is now just allowable, will be soon accounted obsolete. Men of etymological ambition, have introduced and will introduce innovation, under pretence of restoring propriety, and others of the same bent of mind, will find employment in weeding it out. Words continue to change their meaning through caprice, mistake, or accidental association. New terms are wanted, as new doctrines are propagated, new arts taught, new discoveries published, or new inventions described. But the great stock has remained much the same from the days of Elizabeth. From that time it has been the task of linguists to explore the derivation, to regulate the orthography and sound, and to fix the construction of this one set of terms; and we live, I am persuaded, to see these objects pretty nearly effected. From the stores of Greek and Roman literature, and the gay dialect of our Gallic neighbours, our language has likewise been constantly and liberally augmented, especially by translators and men of science. Add to this, that commerce and adventure have brought us something from almost every nation of the world.

Were I to name the great writers who appear to have contributed most toward the gradual revolutions of language, from the time of Sir Thomas More, to our own, I should fix in the

first place, on Shakespere in the walks of imagination, and Bacon in those of science. As their successors, I should take the unrivalled Milton, fanciful Cowley, and Denham the great attuner of our previously discordant verse. In the next age of writers, appears the polished Addison, unfolding the page of pleasing seriousness, interspersed with the chastest humour : Dryden retires from the classic scene in unfulfilled majesty, succeeded and imitated by the laborious felicity of the bard of Twickenham. Our cotemporaries, Johnson in various senses gigantic ; Gray soaring to the farthest bounds of sense, if not sometimes beyond them ; Cumberland of talents sterling and diverse,—and eloquent Burke, the enigma of politics and literature, close the splendid procession.*

In its present state, the English possesses all the riches and variety, which its multifarious sources and long employment upon all subjects promise. There is scarce a known object in material nature ; scarce a sentiment incident to the human breast, or an idea to the human mind that may not be expressed by the tongue of the Briton. For all styles, the grave, the gay, the didactic, the humorous, and the pathetic, it furnishes both appropriate terms and apposite phraseology. In preciseness it may perhaps vie with most others, though there is still sufficient motive to engage the labours of philologers to this most important point. Its simplicity is truly admirable. Disengaged from the load of terminations, and from the consequent train of syntactical rules, which encumbers the classical novice, a few easy variations, and a lucid order, do the whole business of its grammar. Like our crowded marts, and populous cities, it contains the culled produce of every clime. The majesty of the Latin here chastens the gaiety of the French : the copiousness of the Greek enriches the simplicity of the Hebrew : the masculinity of the Teutonic, invigorates the grace of the Italian : and though it is not meant to suppose, that it equals all these in each specified property, yet the happiness of the mixture atones for some trifling defects †. Defects however do exist in our speech, as well as laws, and even some that would admit of reform. A

* *A new constellation, containing many stars of prime magnitude, has shed its benignant beams on the cause of man and liberty ; and given promise of a brighter era in composition. I MUST particularize, without distinguishing their respective merits, the names of Dyer, Mackintosh, and Wakefield ; Holcroft and Godwin ; Southey and Coleridge.*

† *A celebrated foreigner, who has written many pieces in English with considerable humour and spirit, has half ventured to assert the ex-*

want of regular analogy pervades the whole. This necessarily follows, from its being a compound of such different materials. The pronunciation, though more consonant to the orthography than that of France, differs by less certain rules. Words formed by regular derivation from elegant roots are frequently superseded by those of a totally different origin. The scantiness of our syntax, and inflective etymology, hinders us from having all that compass and variety, that an unlimited transposition, fostered by that inflective power, might afford. By the same cause, and the multiplicity of our consonants, the harmony of our speech is considerably impaired;—a quality to which modern foreigners have been particularly attentive. Upon the whole, beauty, symmetry, and force, seem not so well provided for as perspicuity and ease.

But let it be considered, that this very want of analogy complained of, is, in many cases, the cause of considerable variety; and that the trouble it occasions, is sufficiently alleviated by our simple construction. With respect to transposition, much more of it is practicable than modern writers attempt; which appears as though its use was supplied by some other method, and at least exculpates the language. Harmony, a perusal of almost any of our poets since Denham, will discover in an abundant degree. It is now demonstrated, that many charges exhibited against the sound of the English language, have been made by those who knew not its Orthoepy. Two thirds of its supposed shrill hissings are taken off by softening the *s* into *z*. Considerable liberty of transposing is claimed by our poets, and good prose writers have avoided a uniform tone. The complaint against consonants, originated from a mere consideration of their number, without observing their disposition, by which they pass smoothly over the oral organs; and where they do not, they are frequently silent.

Amid that heterogeneous mass of terms which English dictionaries furnish, can we wonder if some are mutually repugnant, some harsh and inelegant, some obsolete, and others quaint? In the vast overflow of books circulating here, may we not expect

an equality of all languages. But such a position, I think, few will give into, who are not confined to the knowledge of one. It seems meant for the excellent purpose of shewing singularity, and ridiculing Sberidan. See Baretti's Easy Phraseology.

It is an advantage not to be forgotten, that the prosaic and poetic dialects, are more different in the English than most languages. In French, I know not what constitutes their poetry, except rhyme and measure.

occasionally to meet with absurd idiom, uncouth combination, pedantic jargon, and trite vulgarity? But let the magic energy of a skilful writer select and combine; let the enchanting grace of a polished speaker express; and we shall have need no more to envy the natives of Attica or Latium, of Italy or France. The same instrument, that, in ruder hands, repels the ear of taste, yields tenfold charms to the grateful touch of an accomplished master. Let a Garrick, a Siddons, speak what an Addison, a Milton, a Barbauld, or a Seward, indite,—and the trivial objections and petty cavils of an elementary critic, will melt—will vanish before the sweets of harmony, and the soul of eloquence.

DISSERTATION V.

ON SOUNDS.

From the dignity of the consequences let him honour the principles. *Harris, Hermes.*

The remaining part of our task is to proceed from the elements of speech and writing, through the necessary rules of construction, to the nicer precepts of composition.

Those sounds formed by the mere voice, slightly impeded by different openings of the mouth are termed vowels;* those that point out various interruptions and modifications of it, consonants†. Of the former we have seven totally distinct; if we take in difference of time or length, eleven; if composition, fifteen. In describing these we shall take them in the order of the scale or scheme vol. i. p. 8.

In the *first*, the lips are rather pushed forward, the upper and under lip as distant as they ever are in speaking, the voice directed so as to strike upon the upper part of the mouth near the throat, and the sound prolonged. The *second* is the same sound shortened. In the *third*, the lips are rather pulled back, and brought nearer, the voice proceeding from a smaller aperture: this shortened is the *fourth*. With the same extent and protrusion of the lips, the voice proceeding from a still straiter aperture, and striking upon the roof of the mouth near the middle, the *fifth* sound is pronounced. A short sound, uttered with the aperture more wide, but the position of the other organs and

* *Lat. vocales from vox the voice, voice-letters.*

† *Lat. consonantes from con together, and sono to sound, letters sounding together with others.*

direction of the voice as the last, is reckoned the *sixth*. Some dialects substitute the long sound of the *sixth* for the *fifth*, though such a sound does not occur in the politer English. As we shall have occasion to speak more of this provincial sound hereafter* I shall put for it *ē* with the mark of a long sound over it. To know what this character denotes, I would desire the reader to pronounce *pain* like *pen* long—*pēn*; and *fairy* like *ferry* with the first syllable lengthened—*fērry*.—The voice issuing from a much smaller orifice, the tongue raised so as to touch the palate with its edges, and the voice directed to the forepart of the mouth just above the teeth, we hear the *seventh* sound of the scheme, or if much shortened the *eighth*. The *ninth* is uttered with the lips gathered to a round form, the voice proceeding from about the same aperture in the throat as the *first* sound and tending directly to the lips, the tongue not moved. There is no short sound directly corresponding to this. For the *tenth*, the mouth must be nearly shut, the lips protruded and almost closed, and the voice lengthened out. The *eleventh*, as commonly pronounced, is the short sound of this; but is now changed, in the genteeler circles, for one of the most difficult sounds that we utter. In this, the aperture of the mouth and the protrusion of the lips are to be in a medium between the sounds *au* and *oo*; but the voice impelled with extreme suddenness so as almost to resemble a short cough †. Its great singularity, brevity, and indistinctness have caused it to be mistaken for several other short sounds. For *a*; affectedly pronouncing “*Sam* people learn *na*thing, they so soon *anderstand* every thing”: for *e*; *Se*m, *ne*thing, and *enderstand*: for *o*; *Som*, *no*thing, *onderstand*. It is of all vowels most difficult to be described, or denoted by other letters; is generally mispronounced; and seems invented for a test of breeding. In a few words the rustic sound of this vowel is authorized by Mr. Sheridan.

A compound sound or proper diphthong is two vowels coalescing, so as to form but one sound ‡. The organs are disposed so as to pronounce the first vowel, but before that comes to a close, or that vocal impulse is finished, they are immediately and insensibly removed to the proper position for the other; and as, in the rainbow, it is not possible to say, here this colour ends, or there the other begins, though in the middle of any streak a definite hue may be perceived; so here, the

* *Dis.* vii. † *Mr. Steele, Prosodia Rationalis, Pref. p. ix.*

‡ They are supposed to answer to the diphthongs of the antients, as they best agree with the etymology, Gr. *Diphthoggos* twice-sounding.

junction between the sounds must be concealed, though the actual expression of both be obvious to the delicate ear.

The only leading sounds of proper diphthongs naturalized in English, are *au*, *ee*, and *oo*. *Au* followed by *ee* forms two different sounds, which are the *twelfth* and *thirteenth* of the scheme. The *twelfth* has the *au* little dwelt on—the organs simply preparing to utter it change immediately for *ee*, on which they dwell a considerable time. The *thirteenth*, on the other hand, has the *au* held very long, so as to appear broad and full; while the *ee* is more slightly touched. The last that begins with *au* has it followed by *oo*, and is placed the *fifteenth* in the scheme. This is exemplified in *sound*, *town*, *trowel*, pronounced *sau-oond*, *tau-oon*, *trau-ooil* or *trau-wil*. *Ec* or *y* (for their difference is trivial) followed by *oo* composes our *fourteenth* sound so frequently marked by the single character *u*, though it has other modes of spelling. *Ec* or *y* is likewise capable of a coalition with any other vowel or diphthong sound whatever, as hinted vol. I. r. III. but as this consists in barely expressing those sounds after it, as *oo* in *yoo*, and is invariably denoted by *y* or *i* placed before them, as in *yarn*, *ye*, *yet*, *glorious*, *foliate*, &c. it needs no further remarks. The proper diphthongs beginning with *oo* or *w* being equally regular (as in *wag*, *oag*; *wafer*, *oaifur*; *wc*, *ooc*, &c.) may be as easily dismissed.

We come now to the consonant sounds, or to the nature of those modifications of the voice, which are effected by the outer organs. From the 16th to the 29th, together with the 34th and 35th, there are couples, every two of which have the organs in the same position, but differ in this; the former has them lightly touching, so as to emit the voice even at the moment of contact, and at the same time a compression near the larynx; the latter is distinguished by a smart pressure of the organs, which totally obstructs the voice till the organs are rapidly disjoined to pass to the next sound. Thus, whoever will articulate *b* or *d* will find the organs but in slight contact, the voice continued, but the larynx or top of the windpipe compressed or strained; in *p* or *t* he will perceive a sudden, forcible stoppage of all sound, which, were it attempted to be held, would produce entire silence.

With this discriminating remark, we may sum up the rest by saying, that the 16th and 17th sounds are formed by the meeting of the lips; the 18th and 19th by applying the upper teeth pretty forward upon the under lip; the 20th and 21st by touching the root of the upper teeth with the tip of the tongue; the 22nd and 23rd by thrusting the tongue forward between the teeth; the 24th and 25th by raising the tip of the tongue to the roof

of the mouth, just behind the place of *d*, leaving an exceedingly small aperture, passing through which the breath makes a hissing or sibilation: The 26th and 27th differ from the two preceding, only in having a larger aperture. In the 28th and 29th the middle of the tongue is raised to the roof of the mouth.

The 30th sound is made by applying the end of the tongue to the root of the upper teeth, and letting the voice glide gently over the sides of the tongue; the 31st by pointing the tongue towards the place of *d* or *z*, and suddenly producing a rattling vibration like the snarling of a dog*; the 32nd by closing the lips, just as in *b*, only extruding part of the voice through the nostrils, while the 33rd just differs so much from *d*†. In the 34th and 35th the tongue is elevated, just as if going to pronounce *g* or *k*, when the voice is impelled through the nostrils, as in *n*. The 36th sound is not a consonant by the scientific definition of this volume, 'tis a hard breathing before vowels, like a sigh‡; but with the more popular description, "letters not sounding alone", it agrees better.

The consonants are divided|| according to the organs employed in their formation into labials, dentals, palatines, and nasals§. The labials *b*, *p*, *v*, *f*, employ the lips: the dentals are formed at or near the teeth, *d*, *t*, *db*, *th*, *z*, *s*, *zb*, *fb*: in the palatines the palate is touched *g*, *k*, *l*, *r*: the nasals pass through the nose, *m*, *n*, *ng*, *nk*. Some have also linguals¶, such as employ the tongue; and gutturals issuing from the throat**, of which latter there is only the *h* in our present English, but they are said to abound in some languages. The distinction into mutes and femivowels, and the subdivisions of these, have already been treated of††. The four unpaired consonants *m*, *n*, *l*, *r*, are denominated liquids, I suppose from their easily mixing or flowing along with the mutes, either before or after them.

It is beyond a doubt that many sounds are articulable, which do not occur in English. On the other hand, we have some sounds, that foreigners cannot master; or not without great difficulty. But it seems that all sounds might be taught, even to adults, by those who understood the philosophical description of them. From the same source might remedies be derived for lisping, which puts *s* for *th* or *th* for *s*—snaffling, which emits

* Whence it has been termed the canine letter. † A person troubled with a cold in the head necessarily substitutes *b* and *d*; as for "No man can harm him"—Doa bad cad harb hib. ‡ Vol. I. art. 17, || Wallis has a similar division of the vowels. § From labium, dens, palatum, nasus, Lat.

¶ Lingua, ** Guttur. †† Vol. I. r. 17, 18, and notes.

part of the voice continually through the nostrils, instead of the nasal sounds only—stammering, especially when it proceeds from a difficulty in particular letters—and for all the minuter defects of articulation.

The past generations have doubtless pronounced differently from the present, using some sounds unknown to us, and ignorant of some that we express. The organical knowledge of sounds will preserve to our posterity the very image of our speech. It will influence the articulation of our public speakers, a character which perhaps most men are called upon in some way to assume. This knowledge can be beneath no one's most fixed attention that considers how great is the influence of manner—how necessary for the artist in any line, to bestow as much care and thought on every minute part of his work, as the observer does on the whole—and how mad it is to defer the mastery of small matters because they ARE small, when, on that very account, they MUST be neglected in the moment of performance.

DISSERTATION VI.

ON LETTERS.

Grammatici saltem omnes in hanc descendunt rerum tenuitatem.

Quinti.

Had the letters been at first adapted to the sounds in an exact method, and continued so, the preceding remarks, together with a scale of characters, had contained whatever was needful, on the subject of orthography. But though the number of sounds, leaving out four for the compounds, is thirty-two; the number of letters leaving out two, as *i* and *u* express compounds, is only twenty-four; *ŷ* and *x* stand each for two simple sounds, *d-zb* and *ks*; *C* has always the sound either of *k* or *s*, and *q* always that of *k*; so that we can discard these four letters, when our list will contain only twenty characters for writing thirty-two sounds.

By this process we not only discover our want of letters, but we find a latent source of immense trouble. If we must express so many sounds by so few letters, it is to be effected by artificial and arbitrary rules, which will be more abstruse than characters accurately fitting; and if we have occasionally, several characters for the same sound or combination of sounds, it will be great labour to impress on the mind, when one, and when another is to be employed. We shall moreover find the task enhanced by the instability and variety of the rules; and, to crown all, a

number of single excepted words and silent letters are to be particularly noted and remembered.

The business of this dissertation, is to furnish some remarks on the letters singly; and we shall take them in alphabetical order.

A, *ā* or *ai* (for the name is contested, though a matter scarce worth debate), is the first letter in all known alphabets, it is said, except the Ethiopic or Abyssinian. Its figure is from the Greek *Alpha*.* *B*, *bee* is the first consonant uttered by children; it is said to have been borrowed from the sheep; its form is the Phenician *beth* reverted. *C*, *see* (a letter useless but much employed) takes its figure from the latter part of the Greek *cappa*. The sound of this last in Greek, and of *c* in Latin, was uniformly hard till corrupted in the latter by the Goths. *D*, *dee* is from the Greek *delta*. *E*, *ee* derives its figure from the Greek *epsilon* with very little variation. It occurs most frequently of any letter in the language, owing to the great number of silent and short *es*, and of diphthongs compounded with *e*. The English abecedarians dispute whether it should be called *ai* or *ee*.

Who shall decide when doctors disagree?

The former sound accords best with the Irish and provincial method; the latter with the pure and established pronunciation. *F*, *ef* is supposed to be formed from the Greek *phi*, though we ever spell the *phi* in Greek derivatives with *ph*. It has been called the Eolian *digamma*, because it answers to two gammas or Greek *gs* one above another. *G*, *jee* as the English, with their usual want of literal skill, have termed it, might be retained for its hard sound in a reformed alphabet; it was first confounded with *j* by the Goths. The Hebrew *Gimmel* inverted, is thought to have formed the Greek *Gamma*; this, with a bottom added, the Saxon letter, and this rounded off the English. The Germans sound it *hy*, and the Anglo-saxon pronunciation appears to have been similar as *gate* (Sax. *geat*) is with country people *yate*; and we find indiscriminately in Saxon records *gif*, *yif*; *gut*, *yet*, &c. *H* is in figure the very *eta* of the Greeks. They had two marks for *spirits* or breathings placed above vowels. But previous to the invention of them, they used *eta* for the rough breathing or our *h*, and shifted, as we now do, and as they might very well have done, without a mark for the gentle breathing. From this, and other petty considerations, it has been doubted whether *b* be a letter†.

* *The sounds of the letters are detailed with a painful but not useless minuteness, vol. i, articles 19—196.*

† *In some periodical print, a few days ago, I met with a bon mot of Mr. Hill, who, hearing its claim to be a letter denied, observed, "Then I shall be LL all my life".*

The other reasons against it are its not being reckoned in the scanſion of antient verſes; which would likewiſe exclude *um* and *s*: its being neither mute nor ſemivowel, as if there could only be two kinds of conſonants; and its being only a ſigh or breathing juſt as it might be objected that *f* was but a puff, and *s* a hiſs. Our countrymen, with their wonted infelicity of nomination call this letter *aitch*! Surely if letters muſt have names this ſhould be called *bee*.

I, *auee* in Greek *iota*, which it reſembles in figure and power, was long confounded with the following letter; they are however as diſtinct as any two letters whatever. Our Engliſh dictionaries unfortunately retain the cuſtom in claſſing their words; a circumſtance, of which young ſcholars ſhould be apprized. *J*, *jai* or *jod* was formerly called *i* conſonant. It appears to have been derived from the *iod* (*yod*) of the Hebrews, miſpelt by the moderns *jod*, and from the Greek *iota*. Conceiving theſe to ſtand for our ſhort *i*, they would expreſs what ſome call *y* conſonant before vowels, as *yeorwa* for *Jehovah*, &c. This would by a more forcible utterance, produce a hiſs; which with *y* is *zy* or *zb*, and this is the preſent French ſound, as in *jardin* (*zhardin*). The blunt Britiſh ear would not reject the addition of *d* to the before corrupted ſound; and thus it became what it now remains, and cannot be reſtored, without incurring the contempt beſtowed on all ſuppoſed affectation. The figure is plainly derived from that of *i*; and perhaps turned at the bottom like *s*, becauſe of the mixture of hiſſing. *K*, *kai* as well as *c* is derived from the Greek *cappa*, which it more reſembles, though *c* conſtantly ſtands for *cappa* in derivatives. *L*, *el* appears to take its form from the Hebrew *Lamed*; *m*, *em* from the Greek *mu*; *n*, *en* from the Greek *nu*. *O*, *oa* agrees in ſhape with the Greek *omicron* or *o* ſmall.* It depicts the mouth in the very act of pronouncing it. It is not eaſy to trace the origin of the figure of *p*, *pee*: the Hebrew character may be made ſomething like it by inverſion, or the ruder imperfect *py* of the Greeks by rounding the right hand angles. Perhaps it was formed by analogy from *b*, or by miſtake from the Greek *rbo*. The uſeleſs *Q* is, at theſe times, maugre the long ſtupidity of learned grammatifts, generally allowed to be a third character for the twenty-ninth ſound, and the *u* always attending it to ſound as *uv*. We ſhall not ſpend any time in enquiring how the Engliſh got it, as it is more worth while to ſeek how they may handſomely get rid of it, and all ſimilar incumbrances to learning. Our Saxon anceſtors expreſſed the ſound of the combined letters *qu* more rationally by their *kw*. Shall I omit

* Omega, the laſt letter of the Greek alphabet, is large o.

or insert the full-length name of this grotesque character?—It is *kyoo*—which Dr. Johnson derives, not from its sound, but from *queue* Fr. a tail; it being an *O* with a tail!

R, of dubious origin, was styled by Persius “*litera canina*” the dog letter, on account of its snarling expression. *S*, *ess* in its shape resembles the curling form, and in its proper sound, the hiss of the serpent. The form is evidently from one of the three small characters of the Greek *sigma*.* It is the peculiar property of *s* to be capable of preceding every other sound, except *z*, *ß*, and *zb*: it is proved actually to do this by instances from several languages, in the Grammar at the beginning of Johnson’s quarto dictionary. *T*, *tee* is from *tau* Greek. It is much revered by some as the true form of the cross. We have no character for the sound *th*, for which the Greeks had *theta*; and the Saxons were so rich as to have one for this, and one for its mate *dh*, although frequently confounded in practice. *U*, *yoo* is from the Greek *upsilon* or *ypsilon*. In the antient tongues, it had not its present compound sound, but that of *oo*: hence *cuculus* is the Latin for *cuckoo*; and *tu, tu* is put in Plautus for the cry of the owl.† *U* and *v* were long confounded like *i* and *j*, and remain so in dictionaries. *V*, *vee* is formed from the Greek capital *upsilon*, leaving out the bottom stem. Its sound may likewise be deduced from it; for, place *u* before a vowel it sounds as *uv*, and no doubt *v* had that sound long which it has still among natives of the metropolis. Utter this with great force, and it expresses the breath through the lips with nearly the same noise as the dental *v*. This last has a near affinity to *b*, which made a jovial epigrammatist remark, that *bibere* and *vivere*, to *drink* and to *live*, were nearly the same. *W*, double *yoo* as we nickname it is not found in what are called the learned languages. When the antient *v* became a dental, doubtless our ancestors, fruitful though not alert in orthographical expedients, doubled the *u* or *v* indiscriminately for the antient sound ‡ (as *ss* was then used for *ß* ||) and the *vv* soon coalesced into one character. This letter always denotes a vowel sound, though long numbered with the consonants. Some have said that *x*, *eks* was first adopted by

* For the use of long and short *s*, see vol. i, art. 7. and the note on it in vol. ii.

† *Tu, tu, istic inquam. Vin’ afferri noctuam,*

Quae, tu, tu, usque dicat tibi. Menaechmi.

‡ *It uuas uuerse and uuerse.* Saxon Chronicle.

|| *Vor mid tuo hondred fypes, &c.*

Our suete Louerd atte lasse fiewede ys suete grace.

Robert of Gloucester.

the Latins in the reign of Augustus, from pious motives. But Jesus was not crucified till the reign of Tiberius; this was probably not the form of the cross on which he expired; and the letter is found in an inscription of remoter date. *Y*, *wauee* is likewise from the Greek *ypsilon*, is always a vowel, and might be spared from the alphabet. *Z*, antiently denominated *izzard* or *s bard*, then *zed* and *zad*, but lately with more reason *zee* and *ez*, had its form of the Greek *zeta*. The account, in a grammar of high authority, of its being compounded of *d* and *s*, seems unfounded, at least with respect to our speech. Perhaps it was meant to say that it has the same relation to *s* that *d* has to *t*.

It has been laid down as a rule, that the names of mutes begin with a consonant, while those of semivowels end with one. This mode of distinguishing, however, is little useful; it loses sight of the natural difference; and tends, like other technical matters when disjoined from reason, to introduce error and debate: the name of the letter being first put wrong, arguments are founded on that circumstance to prove its species. The articulation too of the consonant cannot be so plainly perceived when followed by *ai* or *ee*; and syllables of like sound (as *c a*, *kai*) puzzle learners extremely. It would be better to put the vowel sound first, and let that vowel be always the same. But why stop here? It would be best of all if that artificial lumber of names were totally swept away, and every letter denominated by the very sound it represents. This would facilitate the acquisition of reading; would dispel a thousand quibbles, pedantic mistakes, and vain, puerile quarrels; and would be an important step towards that desirable measure of literal reform, which we shall soon more fully consider.

DISSERTATION VII.

ON PRONUNCIATION.

We should perhaps look for this standard [of pronunciation] only among those who----with the correctness and precision of true learning, combine the ease and elegance of genteel life. *Enfield.*

Many and loud have been the complaints of the difficulty and incertitude of pronunciation. So fleeting, so evanescent are sounds; so easily do they glide, in their transmission, from less to greater aberrations. While communicated merely *viva voce*, they cannot harmonize upon millions of tongues, and books, which have a wider spread, and more accuracy, "cannot speak". To obviate these inconveniencies, as Alexander cut the indissoluble knot, some inveigh against all exactness in speaking; and

though professing to be scholars, never think of rules of pronunciation. Could such a doctrine obtain general assent, there would soon be an end of all extensive colloquial intercourse; and new languages would be springing up by dozens in a century.

Others, with more plausibility, insist on the pronunciation being adapted to the orthography*. This is reversing the order of things. Letters are to be considered as merely the instruments of speech; or as signs by which it can be transmitted. To adjust then the sound to the manner of writing appears like adjusting the country to the map, the machine to the model, or the meaning to the expression. If either must give way let it be that which is less noble. It would be better that the spelling should be adjusted to the sound; but neither can that be easily or speedily effected, as we shall shew in the next dissertation.

Of pronunciation, then, as of speech in general, we must seek other measures: and they are those enumerated by Quintilian, "reason, antiquity, authority, custom". Among these ANTIQUITY is of least regard, pronunciation being improvable, and what is in mode being more generally acceptable, and more easily understood. Yet, other things being equal, this may decide. AUTHORITY is better; though something more than the authority of a single great name is desirable: perhaps even this may preserve from contempt. REASON can only decide by the accent, harmony, and signification. The accent being fixed, it is reasonable that light syllables should drop any vast or cumbersome sounds; hence the pronunciation of words ending in—age—ite and other unemphatical terminations. Monosyllables too that are of small emphasis, that frequently occur, or that are auxiliary to other words are often pronounced differently from their spelling. Such are *would*, *said*, &c. Those who are resolved to pronounce as written, can never speak with a due sentential emphasis, or seem to understand what they utter. Words too that from harshness offend the ear, or from awkward combinations pass with difficulty over the oral organs are to be altered; the disagreeable consonants must be dropped, and those syllables mollified that cannot be endured. But the best regulator is custom†. Not the custom of those who are totally void of care or elegance; nor of those who are ever hunting after modish innovations; but of that middle class of men who unite the advantages of learning, good sense, and access to polite company.

* Dr. Johnson supports this system with his ponderous authority; those who would poise his light argument may consult the grammar before referred to. † *Consuetudo vero certissima loquendi magistra*;

The court-dialect is always held up as the model of pronunciation: the fashion of language like that of dress certainly originates there. But fashion is ever liable to extremes; and in language as in dress it may be prudent not to be totally behind the mode, nor with the very first in it. Next to the court, the stage must be allowed the resort of polished expression; and hither we have all access. Where it errs it will be too modish. The bread of actors depends on applause; but the middle, modest, unassuming path does not lead to applause though it may to esteem. The bar too exhibits the customary pronunciation, and perhaps most justly of all. The pulpit is the most accessible and frequented place of public discourse, but, unfortunately, and culpably, it is least to be relied on. Preachers, I could name, who attend to all the justness and all the graces of delivery. But this will not justify a general recommendation of orators by whom every absurd, every antiquated, and every vulgar form is, at one time or other, authorized. Happily they appear to be improving; and as the theory of pronunciation becomes more fixed, and more obvious, they probably may attain that decent uniformity, that euphony, and grace, which will make them proper models for the middle and inferior orders.

The great mass of corrupted English that forms the different dialects, is too vast to be inserted in this work. A few of the more obvious general faults we must notice; a knowledge of them being of the utmost utility to such as wish to lay aside their provincial habits.

To begin at home*—The Cheshire and Lancashire people about Manchester pronounce *ee* when denoted by *e*, *ea* or *ei* like *ai*. "I refaive sinfair pleasure by seeing others plaished" instead of "I receeve sincere pleasure by seeing others pleefed". Yet in a few words really excepted they sound *ee*; as in *there*, *where*, which they pronounce *theer*, *wbeer*. In *auee* denoted by long *i* or *y* they generally hold the sound *au* long as in *oi*. But for this latter they have a sound in which *oa* instead of *au* precedes *ee*. "Loif and joa-ee refoid in those men whoa have theer treasure wheer theer hearts should bai". *O* before *l* and another consonant they pronounce as they do *ou*; *told* as they would *tould*, &c.—I say as *THEY* would *ou*, for they vitiate that diphthong, making it a compound of *oa* and *oo* instead of *au* and *oo*—*froa-oon* for *frau-oon* and *foa-ound* for *fau-ound*. When hard *c*, hard *g* or *k* comes before *a*, *e*, *i*, *auee* they interpose a *y* as in *can*,

atendumque plane sermone, ut nummo, cui publica forma est. Quint. Inst. i, 6. * I notice only faults that infect their reading; the grosser defects of their colloquial style they are able to rectify themselves.

gallop, ken, get, kind, guile, give, king; pronounced by them *kyan, gyallop, kyen, gyet, kyauceend, gyaueel, gyiv, kying*. When *d* and *t* are followed by *r* or by a short syllable that terminates in *r* they are pronounced here as if followed by *dh* and *th* severally; *fodder, bet-ther d-dbrink, t-three*, for *fodder, better, drink, tree*. Also till of late, an evil practice prevailed, where *gh* is elegantly turned into *f*, of pronouncing it with a rough guttural aspirate*, which I know not how to designate better than by *bb*. Thus *rough* has been called *rubh*; *laugh, labh*, &c. Words too in which *k* is silent have an aspiration for the *k*, as *knife* and *know*.

In Derbyshire, and the borders of the neighbouring counties, they substitute for *ee* a sound unknown to the pure English and compounded of *ē* and *ee*, pronouncing *mē-ee* for *me*. For *oo* they say *ē-oo* as *nē-oon* for *noon*; for *ou*, *ā-oo—bā-oose, tā-oon*. The article *a*, which should be pronounced without emphasis, and almost like short *u*, they are taught to call, in reading, *ai*; and they share in several of the errors before ascribed to Cheshire. They would pronounce “*Hē-ee* is *ai fē-ool*, whoa *gyives* up his moind entoirly to *myē-oose*, and is *plē-eesed* with nothing better than *ai fwē-eeet sā-oon*”.

Yorkshire has in itself a number of different dialects. On this account the various modes of pronouncing that I have observed in different natives of that county are not to be considered as all prevalent in any one place. In Yorkshire *ē-ee* is substituted for *ai*; *pē-een, dē-ee* for *pain, day*: *oa* for *au*; *oal, droa* for *all, draw*: *ee* for the diphthong *ea* where it is to be sounded *ai* in excepted words; *beer* for *bear*, *greet* for *great*; *yē-oo* for *ew* as *fyē-oo* for *few*; *au* for *auee* as *lauf* for *life*; *oo-a* for *oa* as *hoop* for *hope*; *oa-oo* for *oa* when denoted by long *o*; *noa-ooole, soa-oober* for *noble, sober*; also when denoted by *ou* or *ow*, as *soa-oor, snoa-oo* for *four, snow*: *bb* for *gh*, both where it is changed for *f* as in Cheshire, and where it is silent, as *thauhbht* for *thought, rau-eehbht* for *right*.

The natives of Scotland, and of the northern counties of England, frequently substitute *au* for *a* both long and short, as *maun, fautber*, for *man, father*: *ee* for *ea* where it should be short *e* in excepted words, as *deed* for *dead, weepoon* for *weapon*: *ai* for *ee* where it should be short *e* before two consonants, *lairn* for *learn*: *ee* for *auee* as *meet* for *might*; *oo* for *ou*; *soond, coo* for *sound, cow*. The common sound of all their short vowels, is *a*, as *banafat, tarrable*, for *benefit, terrible*. They take every syllable to be long which is followed by a single consonant before another

* Said by Dr. Wallis, de son. formatione to be the old aspirated *g*.

vowel; *mee-rit* for *mer-it*, *pau-nic* for *panic*. Beside which they have a remarkable accentual tone or twang.

The Welch who learn English, speak each consonant with a smart contact of the organs*. The people of Somersetshire pronounce directly contrariwise, as far as respects the semivowels, changing the aspirated into the vocal. For *faith* they say *vaidh*, and their own county they call *Zomerzetzbire*.

The Irish put *i* for *e* as *binifit* for *benefit*; *ai-ee* for *auee*, *lai-eeef* for *life*; and *ai* for *ee* in the same cases that the Cheshire people do. They also pronounce the following single words different from the better sort of Englishmen. *Gather* they call *gether*; *catch*, *ketch*; *course*, *coorse*; *court*, *coort*; *leisure*, *lezber*; *source*, *soorce*; *strength*, *strenth*, &c. *breadth*, *breth*; *sold*, *sowld*, &c. *onion*, *inion*; *reach*, *retsb*; *zealous*, *zailous*; and a few others they perhaps utter incorrectly.

Our *th*, *dh*, and *w* are perpetual obstacles to our continental neighbours when they attempt to learn our speech, and they substitute *t*, *d* and *v* respectively. The English *j* is very different from the French one; the latter is the *zh* of the scheme, the former *dzh*. So their *ch* is our *sh*; and requires a *t* before it to answer ours. Our *sh* they usually give the sound *s*. *Ng* and *nk* too occasion some difficulty, but it may be got over by consulting the *fifth* dissertation.

The Londoners (for THEY likewise have a dialect) adopt those new modes that incline to feebleness and sweetness; and articulate with a rapidity necessarily indistinct. The dental semivowel *v* is by them melted into *w* as *winegar* for *vinegar*. Short *a* is often confounded with *e*; *man* pronounced as *men*; *fat* as *set*; *sand* as *send*: this is objectionable both as emasculating the language, and unfortunately obscuring its sense, making more equivocal words than any other corruption could †.

Those who speak provincially are apt to mispronounce excepted words, and the less extensive general exceptions, in reading, though perhaps they observe them in conversation. The reason is plain. They are sensible of the deficiency of their pronunciation, but uncertain as to the particulars in which it consists. As a remedy they fix upon general sounds for their letters in certain positions, and to these they too tenaciously adhere. To refer

* They say "I forw py Cot that Shenkin ifs a Wifsart", instead of "I vorw by God dhat Jenkin is a Wizard". † Some of those instances of improper pronunciation which are rather modish than provincial are mentioned in the notes. To these add separating short *i* from vowels: *gloree-ous* for *gloar-yous*; omitting *h*, as *andmaid*; or final *r* as *terrow* for *terror*.

them for the propriety of exceptions to common discourse is vain; for they find in general, the farther they depart from their common discourse, the purer their English. When an exception is once adopted by them they extend it too generally, and draw new mistakes from it. Causes of this kind, especially too strict an adherence to what has become superantiquated, seem to have formed the greatest part of our dialects. Let him who would polish his pronunciation be very attentive to these remarks; for, as, without abiding by the regular sound of letters, when that is right, his discourse will appear vulgar; so, and much more, without complying with established exceptions, will it seem unsufferably stiff, affected, and even senseless.

DISSERTATION VIII.

ON SPELLING.

A mighty maze, but not without a plan.

Pope.

Orthography cannot soon be brought exactly to agree with pronunciation. The difficulty of controlling fixed and general customs is well known. Could so extensive a change take place suddenly it would at first make reading difficult; those who are now the best readers would feel the difference most; yet the innovation must be first introduced by them. It would render all the old books nearly useless, for two methods so contrary would never be continued at the same time, especially by the rising race first initiated into the more perfect way.

With only the present characters it is impossible, on account of their great disproportion to the number of sounds*. Those who profess to pronounce and spell alike at present do no such thing; they who on these principles refuse to say *burd* think they preserve them inviolate by pronouncing *berd*, whereas according to the present names of the letters it should be *baucerd*, and to spell *berd* is impossible. New characters indeed might easily be fixed on, and adapted, in the present improved state of grammatical science, with insurmountable accuracy. But would grown men and women—would bishops and doctors—would statesmen and philosophers condescend to learn their alphabet? Would printers, and especially letter-founders, undergo the necessary trouble and incur the expence, for uncertain profit, nay probable loss? And would not the world be pestered with different alphabets, as before with systems of short-hand,

* See *Dissertation vi*, the beginning.

each claiming superiority, yet to an impartial observer exhibiting little real preference?.

The present orthography has its uses. It frequently distinguishes words that are alike in sound; a happy circumstance, because in writing, the tones, looks, and gestures cannot, as in conversation, obviate the ambiguity, nor is the person using the terms at hand to explain*. It likewise serves most excellently to preserve the derivation, and without some such guide etymology would range under the conduct of wild fancy, and form no part of certain science.

It appears to have been primarily fixed upon better foundations than those which at present support it, and to have slid from them by the changes of pronunciation. Fixing *ch*, *ph*, *ß*, and *th* for their respective sounds cannot be successfully vindicated, nor the variety of consonants for the same sound. But, with respect to the vowels, I imagine it was first established that each should be uniformly long when ending a syllable, and short when followed by one or more consonants in the same syllable; that there were no exceptions from the general sounds of vowels; and the short sound of each differed from the long one only in length. Each syllable in which a diphthong occurs I imagine to have been originally two; the former a long one, but the latter being very short was at length diffused; yet both letters were left in writing, and the long sound of the former in speaking. Many colloquial barbarisms confirm this account, as *too-ad*, *coo-at* for *toad*, *coat*†; *ee-as*, *clee-an* for *ease*, *clean*.

In the same manner we may account for silent *e*, and its effect in lengthening a preceding vowel. Each syllable in which one of these is found was originally two, as *fi-ne*, *ma-ke*. The first vowel, by the general rule just laid down, was long; the final *e* frequently occurring became first obscure and then neglected; yet still the first vowel retained its long sound, and the *e* has remained to this day as a mark of it. It has been discontinued in general, wherever it had not this use; but is found in some very old books, in such words as *clea-re*, *fel-le*, *knowled-ge*; where it must have formed a syllable evidently from the mode of division, and its want of any other effect.

The most certain way of proving a vowel short before a single

* Instance—*What do you here? That is, What are you doing in this place? It would be difficult in a perfect orthography, though easy in conversation, to distinguish this sentence from What do you bear? What sound does your ear perceive? † We may well conclude the long sound of most of the vowels to differ from what they have at present.*

consonant sound was to double the consonant, that in division one might certainly go to the former syllable. This, or some equivalent method, has generally prevailed in words originally English, as *manner, penny, fellow, bitter*, &c. But to the genius of the Latin prosody, it is directly opposite. Hence, in derivatives from that language, though the vowel be short, the following consonant is single, as *mer-it, van-it-y*; except through composition, as *al-lure, com-mit, dis-solve*.

This circumstance has introduced much difficulty in the determination of the length of syllables: it will hold indeed that doubling the consonant always denotes a short sound, and with respect to those that are single, a major part of them also are short, but if they be native English they are long.

Consonants are frequently doubled, in old English, for the mere stress of voice at the end of words, as in *stiff, bless, sell*. There is always a stress in a monosyllable if a principal word; but in polysyllables it seldom is on the last in the word. Yet when it so happened they formerly doubled the consonant, as *rebell*; but of late they have almost confined doubling on this account to monosyllables. Hence the analogy which directs the final *l* to be single in polysyllables, double in monosyllables. There is no doubling after diphthongs, because they being known long syllables necessarily imply a stress, and exclude the first reason for doubling—namely to denote short sounds. But none of these analogies are constant. The reader will find their deviations general and particular in vol. I.

It must be carefully remarked that, instead of doubling, in several instances, two different consonants are put; of such a nature as not to alter or injure the sound of the principal one. Thus instead of *cc* or *kk* in words properly English we put *ck, k* being never doubled, and *cc* sounding like *x* before three of the vowels. *f* is not doubled, and *g* where doubled becomes hard; hence writing *dge* is analogous to doubling them, and the *d* does not alter or injure that sound, being compounded of *d* and *zh*. For the same reason and in the same connection *tch* is put for *ch*. Thus the same analogy that directs us to write *lady* and *gladden*, *fury* and *burry*, directs us likewise to write *token, pocket*; *aged, badger*: the same that sanctions *feel* and *fill*, also sanctions *seek, beck*; *siege, bridge*; *teach, stitch*: and on the same principles that we put *curl* and *cull*, *knell* and *kennel*, we put *stark, stack*; *birch, stitch*; *lock, havoc*; *trudge, tonnage**. *B* and *d* are doubled by

* The ten orthographical figures may be just mentioned here; it would be trifling to dwell on them. Prothesis adds and Aphaeresis takes away a letter or syllable at the beginning of a word: Epenthe-

the above analogy in the middle of words, but are never doubled at the end. Proper names baffle and refuse all analogies.

It has appeared, in the course of this dissertation, and throughout the rules for vowels, that much of our pronunciation depends on a due division of syllables. On this subject then it will be well to enlarge a little more. To divide syllables so as to assist our pronunciation it should be laid down as a

GENERAL RULE,

That whatever number of consonants come between vowels, one must go to the former syllable; and if two remain that cannot begin a syllable, then two go to the former. For example I would divide *at-om*, *ba-bit*, *ban-ish*, *mer-it*, *prohib-it*, *cit-y*, *mil-it-ary*, *for-est*, *hom-age*, *clof-et*, *pun-ish*, *ap-ple*, *em-ploy*, *vest-ment*, *chil-dren*, *art-ful*, *pen-ny*, *com-mand-ment* *. The pairs of consonants that will begin syllables are these: *bl*, *br*, *ch*, *cl*, *cr*, *dl*, *dr*, *fl*, *fr*, *gh*, *gl*, *gn*, *gr*, *kn*, *ph*, *pl*, *pr*, *rb*, *sc*, *sb*, *sk*, *sl*, *sm*, *sn*, *sp*, *sq*, *st*, *th*, *tl*, *tr*.

To this general rule there are about five exceptions.

1. When *o* and *u* are not emphatical they end the syllable, as *bar-mo-ny*, *armo-ry*, *ammu-nition*, *adu-lation*.

2. When any vowel except *i* comes before a single consonant or before two that can begin a syllable, and the consonant or consonants are followed by a diphthong of which the leading vowel is short *e* or *i*, the first vowel ends the syllable; as *ce-ta-ceous*, *im-pe-rious*, *fo-li-ate*, *ablu-tion*. But when *i* comes in the same connexion it must be joined to the following consonant as, *perfid-ious*, *humil-iate*, *opin-ion*, *revi-sion*.

sis and *Syncope* the same in the middle: *Paragoge* and *Apocope* at the end. *Antithesis* alters and *Metathesis* transposes a letter; *Archaismus* is an antiquated, and *Exoticismus* a foreign mode of spelling.

* This one comprehensive rule, with the few following exceptions, and the moderate list of excepted words, may be substituted for what have been called grammatical rules of division which are arbitrary, puzzling, subversive of true pronunciation, and contrary to each other. The list of excepted words is valuable, comprizing in small compass the *Essence of Spelling Dictionaries*: it will serve to determine any word by inspection, they being ranged alphabetically;—committed to memory it would effectually lead to a correct pronunciation.

The former FREQUENTLY ERRONEOUS rules of division are

1. A consonant between two vowels goes to the latter syllable, as *ha-bit*, *me-rit*.

2. Two consonants in the middle of a word, that are proper to begin a word, must always begin a syllable together, as *e-fla-blish*.

3. In derivatives formed from words ending in *e* silent lengthening the preceding vowel, if the addition begins with a vowel, the long vowel of the primitive ends a syllable. So from *fame*, *fa-mous*; from *reflore*, *reflo-rative*; from *cube*, *cu-bic*.

4. *Ll* is divided between *a* or *o*, and another vowel, as *al-ligation*, *col-lier*, *fol-ly*. Except where derived from words ending in *ll*, as *tall-er*, *roll-er*.

5. Also vowels end syllables in the prepositions *hy-per*—, and *su-per*—; in the part *u-ni* for *one*; and terminations—*a-do*,—*a-tor*—*o-sis*: as *hy-per-meter*, *su-per-fine*, *u-ni-ver-sal*, *bas-tina-do*, *spec-ta-tor*, *antipto-sis*.

And the following words, with their derivatives, break through the general rule, by dividing in the places marked. The few that are undivided between parentheses are such as would be exceptions from the general rule, the five excepting rules, or their derivation.

WORDS THAT PART THE CONSONANTS TO THE LATTER
SYLLABLE IN PRONOUNCING.

(Abalienation) (abbreviation) a-ble a-blepsis abracada-bra accli-vous (accliv-ity) accre-tive accu-mulate (accum-ulative) ace-tose a-chor a-cre addu-cent adja-cent adju-dicate adju-rate administra-trix adu-latory advo-ca-cy aegypti-acum aeti-tes A-fer affi-dation affi-dature affla-tus A-ga a-gent ag-glu-tinate a-gue albu-go alco-hol alle-gro (al-lig-ature) allu-five alu-del amba-ges a-men ame-nable ammo-ni-acal amo-mum amo-ro-so anna-nas anni-hilable antanacla-sis (anter-iority) antis-cor-bu-tical (anto-eci) a-pex a-phaere-sis aphrodisi-acal apo-rea aposi-ope-sis appa-ratus appa-rent a-pril a-pron arca-num

3. Two consonants in the middle of a word, not proper to begin a word, must be divided, as num-ber, pop-py, hus-band.

4. If two vowels come together, not making a syllable, they must be divided, as di-urnal.

5. Let words formed, or derived, be divided according to their original and primitive, except when a single consonant is doubled or final *e* dropt.

6. Let compound words be divided back again into their primitive parts.

7. Three consonants in the middle of a word that can begin a word, begin a syllable, as illu-strate.

8. If they can end a word they end a syllable, as hatch-et.

9. If the two last can begin a word, or the last be *l*, they begin a syllable, as kin-dle, mon-ster.

10. If the two first can end a word they go to the former syllables.

arma-da asy-lum a-theist (above that length ath—) avi-tous
auro-ra auro-ra bo-rea-lis auxe-fis (a-zure *Sber. Per.* azure)
ba-by ba-con bana-na ba-fin ba-fis becafi-co bibliothe-cal bi-
capsular and bi- when it means two (bif-erous big-amist bif-
ect) bi-tumen bla-tant bo-lary bo-lis bo-lus bo-naro-ba bo-
num-magnum bo-rax bo-ree bo-targo bra-zen bra-vo bri-dle
(brin-dle) bro-cage bro-ker bru-mal bru-nette bu-bukle bu-
colic bu-gle bu-glofs bu-reau bu-rine ca-dence ca-di ca-lif
cameraobfcu-ra cana-ry cano-rus canta-ta ca-pable ca-ret
carricatu-ra (cariofity) ca-rob catachre-fis catechu-men ca-ter
cathe-dral cathe-ter ca-vate ce-city ce-dar ce-lature ce-natory
ce-no-bitical ce-rate certio-ra-ri ceru-men cessa-vit cha-ry
cheru-bic chime-ra (chimerical) chi-rography all in chi-ro
cho-rus chy-laceous and all from chyle ci-ba-rious cicatri-
fant ci-der ci-pher cla-ry cla-vated cli-maſter cli-mate cli-
max clo-ven clo-ver co-chleated co-coa co-e-val co-gent co-
lature colm-ar co-lon co-mital commu-nicate compa-ges
(companion) compla-cent compo-nent conca-vo—Conca-vous
concu-binage concu-pifcence conge-ner (congenerous) conge-
nite conglo-bate co-niferous co-noid (conspiracy from confpire)
confu-tile convi-val co-quette co-rant corro-five co-ving cra-
bur cra-ven cre-dent (credit credible) cre-tated (criminal
from crime) cri-bration cri-nigerous cri-fis cri-te-rion cu-
bation cu-bit cu-ticle cy-cle cy-lindric cy-nanthropy cy-
negetics cy-noſure cy-preſs cy-prus Czari-na de-cent decli-
vous deco-rous deco-rum decre-tal (defamatory from defame)
deglu-tition de-mon (not compounds ex.) de-monology depi-
lous (deprivation from deprive) (derivation derivative from
derive) di-daſtic di-dapper di-duſtion di-geſt ſub. di-late di-
lection di-lemma di-lucid di-netical di-numeration di-petalous
di-plo-ma di-reption di-ruption diſcre-pant (diſcretion) di-van
di-varicate di-vel di-verge di-vers (diverſify) divi-for di-zen
do-nary do-nor do-tal du-cal du-plicate du-rable du-rance du-
rity du-ty dy-naſty e-briety e-bullition echi-nus e-diſt e-dile
e-gotize e-greſs e-gret e-laboration e-laſticity elegi-ac ele-
phanti-aſis e-limination e-lops e-manant (em-anation) empye-
ma e-narration e-natation ency-clo-pe-dia e-paſt ephe-mera
epici cle epiphone-ma epipho-ra epiphy-fiſ epo-cha e-equal
(but equation equator equity equivalent) e-ra erra-ta e-ther
e-thological e-tiology Europe-an exanthe-maſia exe-geſis ex-
plo-rate expro-bate facino-rous faſto-tum fa-mille (famofity)
farra-go fa-ther (ſounded fā-ther) fa-vour fe-brile (febrifuge)
fe-ces fe-line fe-lo-deſe fe-male (feminine) fe-ral ferru-ginous
fe-tus fe-ver fi-laceous (filament) fi-nal fi-nary fla-grant
(fla-gration) fla-men flā-tus fla-vour flo-ral (florid) flo-riſt

fo-cus fo-rum fra-gor fra-grant fre-quent fri-gofaction (frigid)
 fri-gorific fro-ward fro-zen fru-menty fu-cus fu-gitive fu-mage
 fu-mitory fu-mette fu-mid fu-neral fu-nicle fu-runcle fu-ry
 fu-see fu-tile fu-ture ga-laxy (galeas) (galiot) garru-lity ge-
 lable ge-melliparous gene-va ge-nuffection ge-nus ge-rent gi-
 gantic gi-rafole gla-cis glauco-ma (globule) glo-ry glu-
 tinous gno-mon go-la go-vernante (gracile) gra-tis gra-vy
 gre-cism gre-gal (gregarious) gro-cer gy-necocrafy ha-lo ha-
 zel hea-then He-brew He-braifm (Hebrician) hegi-ra he-
 liocentric he-ro (heroine heroifm) hi-a-tus hi-bernal (hin-der)
 ho-cupo-cus ho-ly ho-mer ho-ral ho-ven hu-man hu-mect
 hu-meral hu-mid hu-mour hurrica-no hy-bridous hy-datides
 hy-dra hy-men (hymeneal) hy-pallage hy-phen hy-pogaftic
 hy-pogeum hy-postafis Ja-cent i-chor i-con i-de-a i-dentic i-
 dol i-dyl ignora-mus i-lex illu-mine immu-nity (impediment)
 impe-tus (impious from pi-ous) impu-nity inci-for (incifure)
 incolu-mity indefe-fible indu-bitate inhu-mate (interlin-
 eation from interline) intermi-nation interne-cine invi-tatory
 i-rafcible i-ris i-ron i-ronic i-ficle i-fingglafs i-foperimetric
 i-fofceles i-tem i-tinerant ju-bilee ju-daize ju-dicature ju-gular
 ju-lap ju-mart ju-ment ju-niper i-vory ju-rift ju-ry ju-venile
 i-vy Ka-li (kin-dle kin-dred) la-bel la-bent la-bour (labo-
 rious) la-bra la-dy (Landlady) landlo-per lanu-ginous la-pis
 (lapidift) lâ-rum La-rynx la-tent la-trant la-veer la-zy le-gal
 le-gend lenti-go le-porine Le-the Le-vite li-bation li-bel li-
 bidinous li-bral li-brary li-brate li-cence li-gation (ligament
 ligature) lignumvi-tae li-gure li-lach Li-mature li-mous
 li-quate li-quidity litera-ti li-thography li-vidity Li-vre
 lo-cal lo-cuft lo-hoc lu-bric lu-cerne lu-cid lu-cubrate lu-
 dicrous lumba-go lu-minous lu-nar lu-pine lu..rid lu..fern lu..
 fory lu..tarious ly..canthropy (lyric from lyre) macaro..ni ma..
 crocofm (maidmarian) ma..jor (majority) manda..mus (mar..
 iets) ma..rygold ma..fon mathe..fis ma..trix ma..tron
 (med..iator) me..grim me..tropolitan from metropolis mi-
 crofcope mi..grate mi..natory (mineral from mine) mi..nor
 (minority) mi..notaur mi..raculous mi..fer (mifery) mifno..
 mer mi..fogamift mi..tella mi..tre mo..bile mo..bility mo..
 cho mo..dus mo..ly mo..ment mo..faic mo..tive mo..tor
 mu..cous mu..nerary mu..rage mu..fic mu..tilate mu..tiny
 mu..tual my..ropolift my..thology Na..dir na..ked na..fal
 na..tal na..tive na..ture (natural) na..val na..vel na-vy (navi..
 gation) ne..gro ne..phritic ne..potifm ni..dulation ni..greftent
 ni..fi..pri..us ni..tre no..ble no..cent no..na..gon (nofle) (notable
 from note) no..tice (notify) No..tus nu..bile nu..cleus nu..
 dity nu..meral nuncu..pative nu..triment (obfcenity from

obscene) obsti..pation o..cher octa..vo octo-ber o..dible o..
 dor oede..ma offici..nal o..ker ome..ga o..men (omin..
 ous) o..nanism o..nyca o..nyx o..pal o..pen ophi..tes (o..
 pinion from opine) oppo..nent oppro..brious o..ral (ora..
 tor) o..richalch o..val o..vary o..ver o..vert Pa..gan
 (pageant) pa..god pago..da pa..pal pa..per paraphreni..tis
 pare..nefis pa..rent pa..stry (pasty) pa..thos pronounced pā..
 thos pa..triarch (patriarchal) pa..triot pa..tron (patronage)
 pe..dal pe..dobaptism pe..nal (penalty) (perspiration from per..
 spire) pe..tre (petrify) pha..lanx pha..ros pha..fis phe..nix
 phi..lology phy..tology pi..losity pi..lot pi..menta pi..rate
 pla..cable pla..no ple..nist (plenary plenitude) pli..cation plu..
 ral po..ly poma..tum po..nent (poniard) po..ny po..fy po..
 table pota..to po..tent pre..cept pre..cinct (precious) (precentor
 and all in pre..whose accent is on the second syllable, except
 pre-eminent pre-emption pre..form a pre..fix pre..judge pre..
 ju..dicate) pre..conceit and all in pre..whose accent is on other
 syllables (except precipice predatory predecessor predicate
 preface preference prejudice prelate prelude premices premier
 premises premuni..re preparation preposition presage presence
 president prevalent) pre..terimperfect and pre..ter always but
 in preterite pri..mate pri..me..ro prime..val pri..mogenial pri..
 mordial pri..sage pri..vate (privacy) (privative) pro..bat pro..
 cli..vous (proclivity) pro..create pro..late pro..noun pro..plasm
 prota..fis pro..tecal pro..toplast pro..totype provi..so pru..dent
 pru..nello pu..berty pu..celage pu..dency pu..gil pu..lic pu..
 nice pu..nice pu..nitive pu..ny pu..pil pu..rulent pu..tage pu..
 tative pu..tid pu..trid py..garg py..lo..rus pyri..tes py..roman..
 cy Qua..drate (quadrantal) qua..ver que..rist (querimonious)
 qui..nary quo..rum quo..ta quo..tient Ra..cy ra..mous (ramify)
 (rarify from rare) ra..ven (ravenous) ra..zor re..build and all
 others in re.. signifying back or over again where the primitive
 is an English word, (reduce record and most in re.. that answer
 not the above description) re..bus re..cent re..gal re..gent re..
 gress re..tiform (reticular) re..trospect (reverence from
 revere) ri..gation ri..gol (ritual from rite) ri..val Ro..
 manize rø..sary ro..tary ru..bric ru..by ru..minate ru..mour
 ru..ral Sa..bre sacerdo..tal fa..cred fa..go (saliant) sali..va
 (salivate) Salfu..ginous fa..por (saporific) farco..ma Sa..tan
 fa..tire (satiric) fatu..rity Sa..turn (saturnine) Sa..tyr fa..vory
 fa..vor (scenic from scene) scorbu..tic scri..mer scu..tiform se..
 cant se..cret (secretary secrete) se..nile (senescence) se..nocular
 se..position septu..ple se..quel se..quent (serenity from serene)
 se..rous serpi..go (serpiginous) se..rum se..ton (shadow from
 shade) she..kel si..lent si..licious (sincerity from sincere) si..

necure si-nus si-phon si-ren Si-rius si-ver so-ber so-fa so-journ so-lar (fold-ier) so-lo so-lundgoose sona-ta sono-rous so-phi so-rel fori-tes foro-ricide (special) (spheric from sphere) sphe-roid (spherule) spi-der (spindle) spi-nous spi-racle spi-ral spi-ration spu-tation squa-mous sta-tary ste-reography sternu-tative stew-ard sti-pend (stipulate) sto-lidity sto-raxtree sto-ry stra-tum stro-phe stru-ma stu-dent (study) stu-pid stu-por stu-prate sua-fory (sublimate from sublime) substy-lar su-dation sulta-na (sultaneis) superfe-tate superna-tant su-pine (supinity) su-ral su-furratation su-ture synale-pha sy-phon (Tablet from ta-ble) ta-bour ta-per te-de-um (telescopic from telescope) te-nable te-net te-nure te-por (tepid) testu-dinated the-ri-acal the-fis tho-ral tho-rax tia-ra ti-dings ti-dy ti-ger ti-ny to-ged to-ken to-paz To-phet torpe-do to-ry to-tal to-ward but frow-ard tra-latitious (transmigrate from mi-grate) transpa-rent trape-zoid (treble) tre-foil tre-mor (tremulous) tri-bu-nal (tribune) tri-form and all in tri-three (except triduan trigonometry tripartite trisyllable) tri-turate (triple) tro-chee trophy tro-ver tru-culent tru-tination tu-mid tu-mult tu-nic tutanag tu-telar tu-tor (twidle) twi-light (typical from type) ty-pography ty-rant (tyranny) ty-ro Va-cant (vacuum) vademecum va-ga-ry va-grant (valiant) va-pour (vapid) va-ry va-ward u-berty ve-herent ve-hicle ve-nal vene-nate verbatim verti-go vi-brate vi-carious vi-cenary vi-delicet vigesimal vi-mineous vi-nous vi-per vi-ra-go vi-rile (virility) vi-five vi-tal vi-tu-perate vi-vacity (vivid) u-nicorn u-nit vo-cal (vocative) vo-lant (volatile) volca-no volu-minous votive u-reter ure-thra u-rine u-fury u-tensil u-terus u-vula Wa-fer wa-ry we-zand whi-lom (win-dow) Za-ny ze-chin ze-nith.

Before we close, let us make a few more observations on the subject of reforming the orthography. If it would be so difficult to effect this by a combination of learned men, a new alphabet, and a scientific plan, let none attempt, with the present imperfect characters, to spell just as he speaks, any more than to speak as he spells. Neither let any neglect the acquisition of those elements of orthography, which, though they have never been made regular, are certainly attainable; and to rank as scholars, absolutely necessary. However the simpler mode is very desirable, principally as it would save so much time in education. Let us for a short space persuade ourselves that even this alteration is not impracticable, and proceed to shew in what it must consist, and how it must be effected.

I would propose then a plan of an alphabet which would be

quite novel, yet already in our possession. There should be no need of new characters cast, nor any risk of property incurred. The characters that are wanting should be supplied by a simple inversion of such of the present letters, as are not already inverted, and as will be altered by inversion. We shall see in the scale that the short vowels *o, a, e, i,* and *u* and the consonants *b, p, v, f, d, t, z, g, k, l, r, m, n,* and *h* are already fixed to their proper sounds. With respect to them, it should only be observed, never to put any other character for those sounds, nor to use these characters for any other sounds. There is occasion then to provide only six characters for vowels, because the four compound vowels may as well be expressed by the marks for the single component sounds. There are likewise six consonants to be provided for. I would recommend the following way of marking the twelve letters: χ λ may stand for *au*; $\forall$ ϵ for *ā*; Ξ α for *ai*; $\int$! for *ee*; Ω ω for *oa*; W w for *oo*, which it did represent before, but only in its diphthong position. For *db* I would put Δ Δ ; for *th* ! ! ; for *zb* O S ; for *fb* O c ; for *ng* W w ; for *nk* X x . Beside the advantages before-mentioned, these characters, being the very same as the old ones, would symmetrize with them; whereas other new-invented characters have generally disfigured the page by having too little similarity.

A SPECIMEN.

Hir rests hiz hed su χ on λ e lap uv er $\int$
 A i ω tu F λ it ω n and tu F ω m un-n ω n
 F ϵ r f ω rens fr λ wnd not on hiz umbl burth
 And Melankoli merkt him for hur ω n.

Lerd S woz hiz bl ω wnti and hiz f ω l sins r
 Hevn did a rekompens az lerd S li send
 H ! g ϵ v tu Mizri Δ l h ! had a t r
 H ! g ϵ nd from Hevn twoz Δ l h ! askd a frend.

N ω f ϵ r λ ur s !k hiz merits tu discl ω z
 Or dr λ hiz fr ϵ ltiz from λ er dred ab ω d
 Δ er λ o alo !k in trembli ω h ω p r !p ω z
 Δ i bwzum ov hiz F ϵ aur and hiz God.

* * * * *

f ω n from Δ i twm Δ i v λ is uv n ϵ tiur Kroiz
 f ω n in λ wr α oiz liv λ er wuntid f ω irz.

When this, or any similar improvement, takes place, the greater part of the writers of genius then living must agree to promote it by publishing their original works in this manner. The editors of the amusing periodical works must likewise join their aid. This would soon induce all who possessed either taste or curiosity to learn the twelve new characters; and in this, and acquiring the new habit of spelling, the whole of their task is comprized. A dictionary would likewise be required, in which the old spelling with the derivations must be put between crotchets; and, for etymology, reference must be had to the dictionary, not to the reformed orthography.

DISSERTATION IX.

ON CONTRACTION.

Abbreviations have been much more used than they are at present. The time they save in writing is no object, compared with the trouble they sometimes occasion, and the appearance of hurry and negligence they display. A few of them, however, it has become the established custom to write in certain connexions, where the word at length would appear odd; but in other connexions the word must be written at length. For example, "Master James" says, that *Mr.* Walker, is a very good *master*". The necessary abbreviations only were inserted in vol. I. but it is a nice matter to draw the line exactly.

The derivation of those authorized contractions that are formed from English words is sufficiently obvious. They are sometimes formed by writing the initials, as F. R. S. sometimes by writing the first and last letters, as Mr. a few of the leading letters are taken at other times, as Rev. Hence the necessity of learning each abbreviation singly, and with care, it being a mere affair of memory. The etyma of others are more remote. A. B. is from Artium Baccalaureus; A. M. Artium Magister; B. D. Baccalaureus Divinitatis; B. L. (sometimes LL. B.) Baccalaureus Legum; D. D. Doctor Divinitatis; though all these might seem to be of native growth, the same initials belonging to the principal words in both languages. LL. D. is Legum Doctor: see note on r. 197. M. D. is Medicinæ Doctor; M. B. is Medicinæ Baccalaureus. A. M. (for time) is Ante Meridiem; P. M. Post Meridiem. L. is librae; s. solidi; and d. denarii; lb. is likewise librae, but usefully varied to denote

* Master at length before a name indicates a very young gentleman.

weight. Cwt. is from C. the Roman numeral for hundred; the other part is evident: so is dwt. from d. before explained by denarius, a penny. N.B. is Nota Bene; literally, *mark well*: &c. is the old character for *et*, plainly formed from *e* and *t* fantasticaly made, and c. caetera. The necessity of the full point at the end, or of some tantamount sign, is obvious; but not why that mark is used in preference to any other.

I cannot consent to transcribe the long lists of abbreviations in spelling-books, or to descant upon them farther than mentioning Dr. Wallis's account of that tribe of contractions *ye. yt. yn.* &c. he says, they arose from confounding the Saxon character, for *db* with the old English letter *y*; they being extremely similar in appearance.

The syncope of *e* before *d* takes place, as to sound, in familiar prose (vol. i. r. 47), but is written at full. In verse, it is to be marked, to prevent the clumsier readers from pronouncing it: see rule 200 and note. Syncope is the only poetical licence in English Orthography. That of *ed* is rather a restraint than a licence, as it must of necessity be observed. It is the consequence of our characteristical love of brevity, which also prescribes that *etb* shall not be written in verses; but *s* instead of it.

The ten numeral characters of the Arabians, are termed digits, from the fingers*; that people having first practised Arithmetic on the fingers, and afterwards transferred it to those marks. A more perfect and regular invention has not perhaps been known. Was language equally regular, as far as respects numbers, it would be attended with little or no difficulty; but such anamolies as *twelve, thirteen*, where one would expect *ten-two, ten-three*, disturb that nice correspondence in reading numbers which subsists in their notation. As number is infinite†, we must at last express ourselves by repetition. This repetition would have taken place at millions of millions, but for the invention of the synonymous term *billions*: *trillions* expresses millions of billions; *quadrillions*, millions of trillions, and so on in a millionesimal proportion; the other allowed terms being *quintillions, sexillions, septillions, octillions, nonillions, decillions*. Other terms might be borrowed from the Latin numerals, but the above will serve for reading sixty-six figures, as follows, 123, 456¹⁰, 789, 012⁹; 345, 678⁸; 901, 234⁷; 567, 890⁶; 123, 456⁵; 789, 001⁴; 246, 800³; 135, 007²; 924, 060¹; 813, 006: expressed thus 123 thousand, 456 decillion; 789 thousand, and 12 nonillion; 345 thousand, 678 octillion; 901 thousand, 234 septillion; 567

* Lat. *digitus*. † For directions on reading figures, see vol. i. p. 203.

thousand, 890 sexillion; 123 thousand, 456 quintillion; 789 thousand and 1 quadrillion; 246 thousand, 8 hundred trillion; 135 thousand and 7 billion; 924 thousand, 60 million, and 813 thousand and fix.

The following is the best account we can gather of the origin of what Roman numerals are still retained. I stands for one because it is a single stroke; V for five, because it was the shape of the quincunx, or measure of five ounces, or because it was the fifth vowel; X for ten, because it is two Vs joined at the points. Priscian says I. denotes fifty, because the Greek *nu* had done; and these two letters are easily convertible. C is for one hundred because it is the initial of *centum*; D for five hundred because antiently M for a thousand was oft written thus, CIO, when D was one half of it; M for a thousand plainly because it is the initial of *mille*. A number, with a line drawn over it signifies fo many thousands, I fancy, because such a line formerly represented *m* or *n*.*

The superior excellence of the Arabic notation, will clearly appear from considering the neatness, the facility, and the certainty of the useful art of Arithmetic, in its present state; and the very great contrast to all these that would appear, should we attempt to perform the operations, either by words at length, or by the Roman method.

DISSERTATION X.

ON STOPS AND OTHER MARKS.

A piece, though spelt ever so accurately, cannot be reckoned complete in orthography, until it have inserted the proper stops and other marks.

It has been shewn that a sentence properly consists of a complete assertion, or of that portion of speech which has in itself a beginning, and an end. The beginning and end are sufficiently obvious to very inferior understandings, but if any should demand a criterion by which to discover them, I would give this—they preclude the necessity of a question. For example take this sentence, "Few men will think of boasting perfect innocence, or perfect knowledge". We find there is no necessity to ask any thing respecting the beginning: it is sufficiently clear. But should one attempt to stop thus; Few men.—Any person would immediately enquire, Few men do what? So of any

* Thus $\overline{LX}$ is sixty thousand, $\overline{M}$, one million.

word before *innocence*, where one might stop without any interruption of the kind ; but beginning again after a long stop—Or perfect ; the abrupt commencement would produce a question, which shews that the latter clause would want a beginning, and thence that it must be united as one sentence with the preceding clause. At *knowledge* the hearer could rest without any enquiry; this shews that the sentence is there finished.

These sentences, in the modern practice, are marked either with a period or a colon ; the former, when they are independent of each other or nearly so, the latter, when they cannot well be read separately, though in assertion entire. These two stops are frequently confounded, for an accurate distinction is not easy.

The semi-colon divides those large phrases which at first appear like sentences, but either want something that is in one of them to complete the rest, or are tagged together by a conjunction, improper to begin a sentence. EXAMPLES: 1. "Virtue is connected with eminence in every liberal art ; with reputation in every branch of fair and useful business ; with distinction in every public station. 2. The wages of iniquity afford some temptation ; but to commit sin without any advantage is insanity."

The comma, which affords breathing places to the reader, serves also to distinguish parts that might be omitted so as to leave a certain complete sense, and this within the large divisions. To this it is evident that four of the different directions for commas in rule 217 may be referred. For first the case absolute is most frequently an interpolation, as We sat down ; and, they being arrived, we dined. The three words between commas discarded would still leave a complete sense. The same will hold good of the address ; as, Thou hast saved me, O Lord, in thy mercy ; and of the words of like kind ; as, She sells tea, coffee, sugar, spices. It must be observed that this rule has an exception or two, which to avoid puzzling distinctions, were omitted in the former volume. An adjective, a possessive case, or an adverb may be capable of omission so as to leave an entire sense, and yet not admit of the distinction by commas on account of their close connexion with other words. So if I say, We, frequently, see, worthy, men lose, their, esteem with the multitude :—how odd it would seem to stop in that manner, yet the letter of the rule would warrant it. Again the change of sense or contraction in words would frequently sanction a very wrong use of the comma. So I might write, They, have fixed their, desire, above, this world.

The other use of the comma is to come before conjunctions

and relatives, when the clauses that precede and follow them do not admit the use of a semicolon. It may in general be observed respecting all commæd phrases that they are such as, but for the artificial abbreviations of speech, would require separate sentences*.

Placing the stops will be found a more easy and certain thing if these directions be followed than it has commonly been considered. Two or three persons may stop the same pieces precisely alike; and little or nothing will need to "be left to the judgement and taste of the writer"†. But, in reading, the time which they are to be held is not so easily ascertained. For it is now well known that pauses are many times required where any of these stops would be improper—that pauses of different lengths are denoted by the same stops—and that sometimes pauses of the same length happen to be differently denoted. The points, in short, have principally to do with the grammatical construction; but the pauses, rest, or stops depend upon various other things, as it will be our business to shew more fully in our thirteenth dissertation.

Many good writers fix the relative duration of the four pauses differently to that prescribed in rule 213. They say that as in music, the quaver, the crotchet, the minim, and the semibreve are severally double of each other, so the semicolon ought to be double of the comma; the colon the same of the semicolon, as the name of the latter imports; and the period twice the colon. The analogy of music strengthens the plausibility of this notion, and it agrees with what was before said of the double period, break, &c. The other however is more commonly laid down in elementary books; and hence, neither being constantly right, I gave it the preference.

In what I have to observe respecting the other marks, I shall follow a very loose method, setting down only what I consider as useful or curious, though some of them may thence pass un-noticed.

The note of exclamation has been much too freely used by many writers. It conveys an idea, when put where a full stop would have served the turn, of an author enraptured with himself, when

"Se solum Labienus amat, miratur, adorat ;"

* The rules of punctuation, vol. i. chap. 5. with the enlargements in this dissertation, contain the substance of Dr. Lowth's elaborate essay on the subject, at the end of his introduction. With less abstruse distinction, the remarks in this work, I flatter myself, define the nature and difference of the stops more clearly, and more certainly. † Lowth.

which seldom produces other admirers; for

“Non modo *se solum*, *se quoque solus* amat.”

Dr. Blair mentions one, who, seeing the pages of a certain publication bespangled with this mark, threw down the book without further perusal. I imagine its use should be restricted to such pathetic exclamations as break through all the rules of construction, which, even in narratives, may frequently be necessary, when repeating the words of others; and in the sweet strains of poetry, or the lofty flights of rhetoric, may be allowed to an author himself. But what then shall we say to throwing them in by clusters, as some modest writers do? (!!!) Undoubtedly in burlesque pieces, where wonderment is feigned, it may do very well; but people of taste will not endure it any where else.

The paragraph mark is used principally, if not solely, in the Bible; where its use seems to be about the same with the other paragraph or break. The section employed by other writers is I think of about the same power as the double break. It is said by Ainsworth, in his Latin Dictionary, to be two *ss* (§) and to stand for *signum sectionis*. These two frequently stand for marks of reference.

The caret, which might be called the note of blunder, is totally laid aside in printing; and the need of it is certainly a blemish in manuscript. Young people should endeavour, by facility in spelling, and continued attention, to prevent its necessity; yet when required it is preferable to blunders unnoted.

Inverted commas are used both double and single: perhaps it would be as regular to use the single in common, and the double when one quotation or speech occurs within another. A third distinction might be introduced by marking some at the first and last word; others down the side of the page.

The dash appears to me one of the most convenient typographical assistances of meaning: what we have hinted before respecting points, and what we shall find presently when on the subject of reading demonstrate this. Yet has Dr. Blair involved this, and the useful practice (if not too much hackneyed) of marking emphatical words, in the same censure with the exclamation mark, styling them “feeble props of significancy”. But if there be pauses where a comma is not admitted—if pauses and points be frequently at variance—and if it be desirable that meaning should rapidly open upon us as we read—then will the regulated employment of the dash be still continued by elegant English pens. One is even tempted to enquire why the dash has not supplanted the points themselves, when by its various lengths it is so capable of expressing what *they* cannot—and if

formed of a number of very short lines would so exactly and so easily mark the quantity of every pause.

The dash is frequently put within a word, when a name is hinted, that for some reason must not be at length : thus in the papers we find K—g and P—l—m—t, m—r and c—r—p—n, and perhaps in a short time it will be prudent so to disguise l—b—y and p—l—nt—y r—f—m. These are termed innuendoes. Asterisks answer the same purpose : in which case, the same number are commonly used as there are letters in the words suppressed. These marks are likewise put for deficiencies in unfinished or mutilated works.

DISSERTATION XI.

ON PROSODY.

Je dis que nous faisons mal de negliger notre Prosodie, puisque la parole etant l'organe de la pensee, on est louable de s'appliquer a la rendre plus insinuante, plus propre a persuader, plus capable de peindre ce que nous pensons. D'Olivet.

In prosody, grammarians have been wont to include the consideration both of quantity and accent. Quantity corresponds to time in music, and is the length which the note or syllable is to be held.

The extension of syllables takes place two ways ; by lengthening the vowel, and by dwelling on the final consonant. The lengthening or shortening of the vowel depends upon the circumstances mentioned in the seventh and eighth dissertations, and upon various rules in vol. I. When the vowels are lengthened their sound is likewise changed ; whence the rules belong not so properly to the present head as to Orthography. If a long syllable among the antients were double of a short one, the same does not hold with us. Our short vowels are generally pronounced as short as possible ; our long ones are held so as at least to shew a possibility of shortening them ; but both differently in different words, and in the same word differently connected.

As to the prolongation of consonants *, none of the fourteen femivowels is pleasant to the ear when produced but *l, n, v, z,* and *ng*. None but these then should be lengthened out, except where a vehemence of passion expressed by that letter makes it necessary. In terrible descriptions the *r* should be lengthened ; but in all soft or cheerful sentences must be very slightly touched. None of these should be prolonged but at the end of accented syllables where the preceding vowel is short ; nor any where but at the end of words except to signify strong emotions, and never

* *Sheridan, Art of Reading, Part I, Lecture 2.*

at the end of a sentence.

Accent is a mode of distinguishing one syllable in a word that contains more than one; a very necessary contrivance, without which we should hear a number of equal syllables, and should have no sign of the commencement and termination of words, unless a considerable pause should be introduced between them, and that would render discourse tedious and obscure. This distinction was marked by the antients with a different tone or musical note. But we do not use this kind of accent. Ours is nothing but a simple stress of voice. In a long syllable, the stress consists in a plain and forcible expression of the vowel; in a short syllable there is generally a plainer expression of the vowel, and a force, or what the Greeks called a thesis, upon the consonant. By this force, thesis, or weight, is the prosody of English conducted. A sentence spoken with the ancient accent has been compared to a march played with the trumper, which gives both the movement and the tune; a sentence of English resembles one beat on a drum, by which the movement is preserved, but the difference of the notes is imperceptible. The voice however does give various notes in the compass of a sentence, but not according to any rule, and should it be perfectly monotonous the accent would be the same.

Syllables may be divided into the heavy, the light, and the very light*. Thus we find in the words *incorruptibility*, *comprehensibility*, that the fifth syllable is heavy, as one will be in every word; the first and third are light; and the second, fourth, sixth, and seventh very light.

The rules for placing the heavy accent, or that which distinguishes words, have been given in vol. I.—yet attention to the best speakers and dictionaries must be used along with them; and it will appear from the next dissertation, that a frequent reading of the poets will be a great help†. With respect to the

* This distinction is borrowed from Mr. Steele's *Prosodia Rationalis*. He describes the difference by the walk of a lame man, in which the setting down of his sound foot is heavy, that of his diseased foot is light, but the raising of both feet is equally very light, page 21. Mr. Steele does not apply the term accent as we usually do; the heaviness or lightness of syllables he terms the poize, p. 77.

† Were a book constructed containing a single verse placed after every polysyllabic word in the language, alphabetically arranged, it would point out, prove, and infix in the memory our whole prosody better than any other thing could. Neat contrivance would make one line frequently settle two or three words; this would make room for distichs and stanzas, to relieve the driness of such a collection.

fainter stresses, which has been less considered, I believe no word whatever has more than two very light syllables together.

The emphasis which is laid on significant monosyllables, to distinguish them from particles, has much the same properties as the syllabical accent. Thus, "to the Lord", has the appearance of a word of three syllables accented on the last, like *afternoon* or *correspond*.

DISSERTATION XII.

ON VERSIFICATION.

Know
What's roundly smooth, or languishingly flow;
And praise the easy vigour of a line,
Where Denham's strength and Waller's sweetness join. *Pope.*

Verse is discourse in a measured and musical arrangement. The music of English verse depends on the disposition of accents. The measure depends on the number of feet in the verse or line; and in some kinds on the number of verses in a stanza. To these is sometimes added, the embellishment of rhyme.

A foot in verse corresponds to a bar in music. The former is a number of syllables connected by the place of the accent, as the latter is a number of notes marked out by the time. The feet that can be used in poetry are in number eight. Four consist of two syllables each. The IAMBIC consists of an unaccented syllable before an accented one, as *command*; the trochaic of an accented before an unaccented one, as *battle*; the PYRRHIC of two unaccented, as *in the*; the SPONDEE of two accented, as *great hopes*. Four are composed of three syllables each. The DACTYL has the first syllable accented, as *mystery*; the AMPHIBRACH the middle, as *resemble*; the ANAPAEST the last, as *controvert*; and the TRIBRACH has not any of the three accented, as in "the du-ty of the young"—those syllables in Italics.

The number of feet in a verse must not be less than two, otherwise there could be no comparison nor variety. And they ought not to exceed five disyllable, nor four trisyllable feet, because in that case the extremes would be too distant for comparison, and the ear would be fatigued for want of a competent rest. Within these bounds the different feet may form verses of any length. The simplest kind are combinations of the same feet. But there can be none from the pyrrhic, spondee, or tribrach, as these would present a continued, tiresome uniformity.

Those of five feet are termed *pentameters*; those of four *tetrameters*; of three *trimeters*: those of two may by a new-coined word be styled *bimeters*.

EXAMPLES OF THE DISSYLLABIC FEET.

IAMBIC.	5. Thy prayer	thy praise	thy life	to vice	unknown
	4. His glow	ing cheek	his ard	ent eyes	
	3. He chose	a mourn	ful muse		
	2. Unheard	unknown			
	He made	his moan			

TROCHAIC 4. Trembling | hoping | ling'ring | flying.

EXAMPLES OF THE TRISYLLABIC FEET.

DACTYL.	4. From the knaves	and the fools	and the fops	of the time
	3. And the spark	les that flash	from his eyes	
	2. How they hiss	in their hair		

DACTYL 2. Happy and | glorious.

AMPHIBRACH 3. The fiddle's | a wooden | projection.

The same line may likewise contain different sorts of feet.

EXAMPLES OF MIXED VERSES.

TRO. IAMB.

Each in | his nar | row cell | for ev | er laid.

IAMB.

AMPH.

And why? | because | he thinks | himself | immortal.

TRO.

SPOND.

AMPH.

IAMB.

Throws his | steep flight | in many | an ær | y whirl.

The measure of a verse depends on the number of feet, and not, as many suppose, on the number of syllables. The above lines are all of one measure, though the first contains ten syllables, the second eleven, the third twelve.

As a single syllable produces no idea of modulation; as a single foot gives no opportunity of comparison; so a single line is not acknowledged as verse, except connected with others to which it some way corresponds. It is from several verses in some certain order that we receive the pleasure of tuneful numbers. A principal instrument in connecting, and which itself makes a part of the music, is the rhyme. Rhyme is an agreement of the sound at the ends of verses: it is essential to it that the former part in one syllable which agrees should be different to the former part in the other. *Kite* and *light* are rhymes; but

light and *delight* are not; for their concluding syllables are just alike: such endings are not similar but the same. Rhyme is intended for the ear alone, consequently syllables terminating with different spelling are not to be rejected if they sound alike; and syllables of the same final spelling are no rhymes if their sounds disagree. *Laugh* makes a perfectly good rhyme to *staff*; but *through* and *cough* are inadmissible. The rhyme must always fall upon the accented syllable; but there may come one or two unaccented syllables after it, provided they be of exactly the same sound in the lines that rhyme. Complete rhymes are recognised in *clamour* and *flammer*, *flattery* and *battery*.

Let us proceed to the different kinds of verses. Their difference founded on their composition and order.

First, we have such as are written in succession, without any divisions but the single and double breaks or paragraphs, as in prose, and having their lines composed in exactly equal numbers. The *heroic* verse is in pentameters; and each pair of verses, or couplet, rhymes. Its feet may be of the same kind or different, but not at pleasure. If they be of the same kind they must be all iambs, as

With heads	declin'd	ye ce	dars hom	age pay
Be smooth	ye rocks	ye rap	id floods	give way.

The junction of five feet of any other sort forms a line totally distinct, and every way different from these. Other feet may be introduced but under considerable restrictions. The amphibrach, the anapaest, and the spondee may be substituted for the iambic almost anywhere, provided the greater part of the line remain iambs, as

ANAP.

He al | so against | the house | of God | was bold—

AMPH.

AMPH.

Of riot | ascends | above | their lofty | cft towers—

SPOND.

The lewd | vain world | that must | receive | him soon.

The others may be introduced, but not so freely. None of them must close a line in this species of verse. The pyrrhic ought to be compensated by a spondee posterior to it, which reduces the quantity of the two to an exact equivalence with two iambs: instance

AMPH. IAMB. PYR. IAMB. SPOND.

As being | the con | trary | to his | high will.

Our modern versifiers have endeavoured, too successfully, to lay aside the trisyllabic feet in heroic metre. They never use

them unless when they suppose the word capable of ellision or syncope *; as when they write *recov'ry* for *recovery*: it frequently happens however that this artificial mangling is disregarded by readers of taste, who thus strike out real beauties in reading, which yet the poet never meant.

A privilege was formerly claimed, when an overflow of meaning happened at the conclusion of a couplet, to discharge it two ways. To the second line of the couplet they allowed an additional foot, styling that line an Alexandrine, as

Whole rivers here forsake the fields below,
And wondering at their height in airy chan-nels flow;
Or they formed a triplet, three lines terminating with the same rhyme, as

Sir Job sail'd forth, the evening bright and still,
" No place on earth (he cry'd) like Greenwich hill"!
Up starts a palace, lo, th' obedient base
Slopes at its foot, the woods its sides embrace }
The silver Thames reflects its marble face.

But later poets have so little availed themselves of these licences, that imperious critics will soon contest their legality. They were laid aside in the more finished works of Pope, and scarce occur in those of Johnson, Goldsmith, Churchill, Mason, or the better sort of living writers.

The next species of paragraphed verse differs from the heroic in nothing, as far as relates to inflexible rules, but in the want of rhyme. This has the name of *blank verse*. The heroic is required to be more melodious and refined; this has more masculinity and force. The middle pauses of the lines are more varied, full, and frequent in blank verse.

This latter species is employed in vast, extensive, and magnificent subjects. A major part of our tragedies, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and *Paradise Regained*, Thomson's *Seasons*, Young's *Night Thoughts*, Akenfide's *Pleasures of Imagination*, and other celebrated pieces are in blank verse. Dryden's translation of Virgil, Pope's of Homer, that of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* published by Garth, the capital Fables, Effays, and Satires of Dryden, Pope, Young, Johnson, Goldsmith, Hayley, Cowper, and others, are in the heroic measure.

Another species there is of four feet, either wholly or mixed iambs. In the looser writers it has also its triplet, and sometimes drops the unaccented syllable in the first foot, as in the

* Since writing this, I find Mr. Southey, in his poem, *Joan Arc*, has struck into a different path; not having the poem by me, I cannot give examples.

third and fourth lines of this example; a liberty which should be sparingly used, if at all.

Oft on a plat of rising ground,
I hear the distant curfew sound,
Over some wide-water'd shore,
Swinging slow with solemn roar;
Or if the air will not permit,
Some still removed place will fit,
Where glowing embers through the room
Teach light to counterfeit a gloom.

Milton.

Butler's burlesque poem of Hudibras, Swift's high-wrought Verses on his own death, Gay's Fables, and Cotton's Visions, are among the best productions in this species. No blank verse of the same measure has yet obtained currency among our literati. Perhaps it has not suited in point of expression. Perhaps they have despaired of making it sufficiently remote from prose.

The last kind of paragraphed verse that we shall notice, is the tetrameter amphibrachial or anapaestic. This is generally composed with sufficient negligence, being all anapaests or all amphibrachs, or the two mixed; and these different sorts of lines promiscuously intermingled. Sometimes an iambic is admitted, especially at the end of the verse. This species has always rhyming terminations. Goldsmith's Retaliation, Anstie's Bath Guide, and Simkin's Letters are in this metre.

We now come to more laboured kinds of verse, namely, those in which the same numbers, returning at measured intervals, form staves or Stanzas. Of these, the several sorts in actual use are numerous; in possibility almost infinite. We shall enumerate some of the most remarkable, describing them in terms already explained in this discourse, giving a name where the species possesses one, and referring to some celebrated poem written in the same; or where that does not occur, or will not be likely to answer every purpose, subjoining an example at the end of the enumeration.

I FOUR-LINED. i. Iambic. (Species 1) Pentameter alternate. Name *Quatrain*. Example, Gray's Elegy in a Country Church-Yard. (2) Tetrameter alternate. (3) Tertrameter alternately blank and rhyming—Shenstone's *Jemmy Dawson*. (4) As 2. the last verse only two feet—Pope on Solitude. (5) As 2. terminating the 1st and 3rd verses with an amphibrach. (6) Alternately tetrameter and trimeter, alternate. Name, *Common metre*, or *Ballad Stanza*—Goldsmith's *Edwin and Angelina*. (7) The same alternately blank and rhyming. (8) Two pentameters, two trimeters blank—Collins's Ode to Evening. (9) 1st and 3rd final amphibrach, trimeter, alternate. (10) 1st

Pentameter, 2 middle tetrameter, last Alexandrine, couplets.—
 ii. Trochaics.—(11) Three with a final accented syllable, couplets. (12) The same alternate. (13) As 12. first and third lines four trochaics—Glover's Song, Hosier's Ghost.—iii Anapaestic.—(14) Alternately tetrameter and trimeter, alternate, first foot of each iambic.—iv.—Various. (15) Alternately two anapaests and two amphibrachs, alternate. (16) Three lines each a trochee, an amphibrach, an anapaest, and another amphibrach; the fourth a trochee and amphibrach; blank. Name *The Sapphic*. (17) The same might rhyme alternately, and be termed *The rhyming Sapphic*.

II. SIX-LINED. i. Iambic. (18) Alternately tetrameter couplets, and single trimeters rhyming to each other—Mrs. Barbauld's Hymn to Content. (19) As 2. together with a tetrameter couplet. (20) As 6. the first and third lines broke into short couplets. (21) As 1. together with a pentameter couplet. (22) As 6. with a tetrameter couplet—Earl of Dorset's Song on board. (23) A tetrameter quatrain and pentameter couplet, Gay's Blackeyed Susan. (24) As 23. last verse an Alexandrine. ii. Trochaic.—(25) Quatrain and couplet, each verse three feet and a final accented syllable.

III. EIGHT-LINED. (26) As 2. with two couplets, of which three lines are iambic tetrameters, the last an Alexandrine, Gray's Hymn to Adversity. (27) Two amphibrachs and an iambic, (sometimes three anapaests) rhyming alternately—Shenstone's Pastoral Ballad.

IV. (28) NINE-LINED. Two quatrains, the middle lines forming couplets; a concluding Alexandrine forming a couplet with the preceding line—*Spenser's Stanza*.

V. TEN-LINED. (29) Two quatrains and a couplet ending with an Alexandrine—Dr. Lowth's Choice of Hercules. (30) As 6. and 18. last line but 3 tetrameter—Gray's Ode to Spring.

VI. Various. (31) *Cowley's Pindaric*; a mixture of all sorts of lines in any kind of Stanza. Of course, as Mr. Bysshe has remarked, "no example can properly be given, where no rule can be observed". This species of writing, once very popular, is now generally condemned. (32) *The true Pindaric* consists of three extended stanzas, termed STROPHE, ANTISTROPHE, and EPODE, several times repeated. See West's translation of Pindar. (33) *The Sonnet* is a peculiar species of poem, the only essential of which seems to be that the whole be exactly fourteen lines. Milton borrowed it from the Italians, and it has been lately revived by Smith, Seward, Newton, and others.

This enumeration of Stanzas may serve as the basis of a more exact classification, and of a nomenclature of specific terms

proper to the different varieties. I had observed about as many more species, which are omitted for want of room. Beside which, many stanzas are and more may be formed from couplets by throwing the break to a stated number of lines; instance Addison's version of part of the 19th Psalm.

Examples of those species in which no celebrated poem is referred to.

- (2) Ah me! the blooming pride of May
And that of beauty are but one;
At morn both flourish bright and gay,
Both fade at evening, pale and gone. *Prior.*
- (5) What though no grants of royal donors,
With pompous titles grace our blood,
We'll shine in more substantial honours,
And to be noble, we'll be good. *Gilbert Cooper.*
- (7) When nature fails, and day and night
Divide thy works no more,
My ever grateful heart, O Lord,
Thy mercy shall adore. *Addison.*
- (9) 'Twas when the seas were roaring
With hollow blasts of wind,
A damsel lay deploing
All on a rock reclin'd. *Gay.*
- (10) In caves of night, the oracles of old
Did all their mysteries unfold;
Darkness did first religion grace,
Gave terrors to the god, and reverence to the place. *Yalden.*
- (11) Pass the world and what's behind?
Virtue's gold by fire refin'd;
From a universe deprav'd
From the wreck of nature sav'd. *Brooks.*
- (12) Yonder seats and fields of light
Let thy ravish'd thought explore;
Wishing, panting for thy flight!
Half an angel; man no more.
- (14) How fair is the rose! what a beautiful flower!
The glory of April and May!
But the leaves are beginning to fade in an hour;
And wither and die in a day. *Watts.*

- (15) By our pastor perplex,
How shall we determine?
"Watch and pray" says the text;
Go sleep, says the sermon.
- (16) Now the fierce North wind, with his airy forces.
Rears up the Baltic to a foaming fury,
And the red lightning, with a storm of hail, comes
Rushing amain down. *Watts.*
- (17) Ignorance childish stands agape with wonder,
When, all familiar to the man of science,
Blazes the meteor, roars aloud the thunder,
Hushing defiance.
- (19) Devouring time, with stealing pace,
Makes lofty oaks and cedars bow;
And marble towers, and gates of brass,
In his rude march he levels low:
But time destroying far and wide,
Love from the soul can ne'er divide. *Barton Booth.*
- (20) As Quin and Foote
One day walk'd out
To view the country round,
In merry mood
They chatting stood
Hard by the village pound.
- (21) Cease, then, ah cease, fond mortal, to repine
At laws which nature wisely did ordain;
Pleasure, what is it? rightly to define,
'Tis but a short-lived interval from pain:
Or rather, each, alternately renew'd,
Gives to our lives a sweet vicissitude.
- (24) 'Tis true, of old, the patriarch spread
His happier tents that knew not war,
And chang'd at will the trampled mead
For fresher greens and purer air;
But long has man forgot such simple ways;
Truth, unsuspecting harm!—the dream of antient days. *Whitehead*
- (25) On the mossy bank she lies
(Nature's verdant velvet bed)
Beauteous flowers meet her eyes,

Forming pillows for her head;
Zephyrs waft their odours round,
And indulging whispers found.

Let us pass to a slight consideration of the elegancies of verse, those higher requisites without which, it will be accounted worse than the plainest prose, MELODY, HARMONY, and EXPRESSION.

MELODY is the agreeable or delightful impression made on the ear by the simple beauty of smaller parts. It depends 1st, on the exactness and nature of the feet. A mixture of feet is prejudicial to simple melody. Verses are more melodious too composed of the iambic or anapaestic feet than of the amphibrachic or trochaic, because they repose upon the terminating strong syllables, and music universally tends to the graver notes. The finest melody is likewise produced where the accented syllable sounds long upon the vowel. The first two of the following lines have all these requisites; the other none of them.

Ye chief for whom the whole creation smiles! *Thomson.*
May the spark drop from reason that wakens the flame!

Thou shalt be punish'd for thus frightening me. *Shakspeare.*
How wanton sits she amidst nature's wiles. *Young.*

2ndly, The final pause should be of a considerable length at every line; of a very great length, a semicolon at least, every couplet; and not less than a colon at the conclusion of Stanzas. 3rdly, Much of the melody of verse depends upon what is called the *cesural pause*. The cesura or division of the line falls, consistently with a degree of melody, on three different parts of the line; at the end of the second foot, in the middle of the third, or at the end of the third.

1. Unlock your springs,—and open all your shades.
2. Live in description—and look green in song.
3. With tender billet-doux,—he lights the pyre
And breathes three amorous sighs—to raise the fire.

Of these, the second is most melodious, dividing the line most equally; then the first, because in it the longer portion of sound is latest; the last is least musical, yet so near the middle of the line as to be within the bounds of melody. The superiority of the middle over the other, and of the first over the last may be illustrated, very intelligibly, by lines similarly divided, thus

- (15) By our pastor perplex,
How shall we determine?
"Watch and pray" says the text;
Go sleep, says the sermon.
- (16) Now the fierce North wind, with his airy forces.
Rears up the Baltic to a foaming fury,
And the red lightning, with a storm of hail, comes
Rushing amain down. *Watts.*
- (17) Ignorance childish stands agape with wonder,
When, all familiar to the man of science,
Blazes the meteor, roars aloud the thunder,
Hushing defiance.
- (19) Devouring time, with stealing pace,
Makes lofty oaks and cedars bow;
And marble towers, and gates of brass,
In his rude march he levels low:
But time destroying far and wide,
Love from the soul can ne'er divide. *Barton Booth.*
- (20) As Quin and Foote
One day walk'd out
To view the country round,
In merry mood
They chatting flood
Hard by the village pound.
- (21) Cease, then, ah cease, fond mortal, to repine
At laws which nature wisely did ordain;
Pleasure, what is it? rightly to define,
'Tis but a short-lived interval from pain:
Or rather, each, alternately renew'd,
Gives to our lives a sweet vicissitude.
- (24) 'Tis true, of old, the patriarch spread
His happier tents that knew not war,
And chang'd at will the trampled mead
For fresher greens and purer air;
But long has man forgot such simple ways;
Truth, unsuspecting harm!—the dream of antient days. *Whitehead*
- (25) On the mossy bank she lies
(Nature's verdant velvet bed)
Beauteous flowers meet her eyes,

Forming pillows for her head ;
 Zephyrs waft their odours round,
 And indulging whispers found.

Let us pass to a slight consideration of the elegancies of verse, those higher requisites without which, it will be accounted worse than the plainest prose, MELODY, HARMONY, and EXPRESSION.

MELODY is the agreeable or delightful impression made on the ear by the simple beauty of smaller parts. It depends first, on the exactness and nature of the feet. A mixture of feet is prejudicial to simple melody. Verses are more melodious too composed of the iambic or anapaestic feet than of the amphibrachic or trochaic, because they repose upon the terminating strong syllables, and music universally tends to the graver notes. The finest melody is likewise produced where the accented syllable sounds long upon the vowel. The first two of the following lines have all these requisites; the other none of them.

Ye chief for whom the whole creation smiles ! *Thomson.*
 May the spark drop from reason that wakens the flame !

Burgoyne.

Thou shalt be punish'd for thus frightening me. *Shakespeare.*
 How wanton sits she amidst nature's wiles. *Young.*

2ndly, The final pause should be of a considerable length at every line; of a very great length, a semicolon at least, every couplet; and not less than a colon at the conclusion of Stanzas.

3rdly, Much of the melody of verse depends upon what is called the *cesural pause*. The cesura or division of the line falls, consistently with a degree of melody, on three different parts of the line; at the end of the second foot, in the middle of the third, or at the end of the third.

1. Unlock your springs,—and open all your shades.
2. Live in description—and look green in song.
3. With tender billet-doux,—he lights the pyre
 And breathes three amorous sighs—to raise the fire.

Of these, the second is most melodious, dividing the line most equally; then the first, because in it the longer portion of sound is latest; the last is least musical, yet so near the middle of the line as to be within the bounds of melody. The superiority of the middle over the other, and of the first over the last may be illustrated, very intelligibly, by lines similarly divided, thus

It is necessary for the preservation of melody, that the rhymes be so near each other, that the latter may strike before the impression of the former have left the ear. The syllables that rhyme ought either to be open like *day, play*: or ending with very smooth consonants, as *soul, control*. Harsh rhymes, as *bats, bats*; *launch, branch*, are destructive of fine sound.

HARMONY depends on the proportion and relation of the several parts, and takes in that necessary charm, variety. For the sake of this, some things are admitted inconsistent with the finest melody, though nothing absolutely harsh or dissonant. It depends first on the introduction of various feet, either in a constant rotation, as in the sixteenth species of stanza, or more diversified as in the blank and heroic verse. We may instance in the following passage from the most uniform of versifiers.

In these gay thoughts the Loves and Graces shine,
And all the Writer lives in every line;
His easy art may happy nature seem,
Trifles themselves are elegant in him.
Sure to please all was his peculiar fate,
Who without flattery pleas'd the fair and great;
Still with esteem no less convers'd than read,

With wit well-natur'd, and with books well-bred. *Pope.*

Here the uniformity of the first three lines, all iambics, is relieved by the trochee at the beginning of the fourth, which, though it deviates a little from the highest melody, is more acceptable than a continuation of the same unvaried strain. Then follow three lines, each commencing with a trochee; then a fourth with an iambic. Here is not only variety but proportion. There is uniformity in the regular number of feet, and the general prevalence of iambics; this uniformity is relieved by the variety of the trochaic; and this variety is composed to regularity again by the proportion of the lines in which it is introduced. Three iambics beginning are followed by one trochaic, and then three trochaics by one iambic. This pleasing return of regulated varieties should likewise itself be varied into many different forms, both with respect to order and number.

Another instance of harmony arising from a regular disposition of various feet, by an artist the greatest contrast to Pope, one who has in his numbers all the diversified charms that result from genius, knowledge, and care, with all the blemishes that proceed from negligence and hurry, may be found in *Paradise Lost*, book iv, v. 131 to 159; a work generally accessible, and therefore, though I should gladly have enlivened and enriched this page with the quotation, the paucity of the remaining pages forbids me. In this beautiful piece, though we have not those

rounds before described, there is such harmony arising from a constant change yet constant resemblance, as, if produced without technical design, is a master-piece of native ability. Scarce any two lines are alike; yet not one is inconsistent with a degree of melody; and there is a predominance of pure iambic lines, and accented long syllables that diffuses over the whole a delightful smoothness, fine beyond measure.

2ndly, In lyric measures, harmony depends on the suitability of the numbers and of the feet. A single line of iambics among a number of amphibrachs, or of anapaests among a number of trochaics would be quite unharmonious, because the odd line would be of a contrary movement to the rest. These three in Dryden's most admired ode are an instance.

Behold how they toss their torches on high,
How they point to the Persian abodes,
And glittering temples of their hostile gods.

Equal numbers, as the quatrain and couplet, have most harmony, it decreases as the equality lessens; and if one verse be at any time less than half a contiguous one, it is totally discordant; as these of Herbert.

To write a verse or two is all the praise,
That I can raise:
O raise me then, poor bees, that work all day,
Sting my delay.

3rdly, The rhymes should be agreeably varied upon the open and smooth, with a small mixture of firm rhymes, such as *Lord, record; plant, scant*. 4thly, No other variety will prevent lassitude, unless the longer sentential pauses be sometimes removed from the close of the couplet, and placed in different parts of the line. This should not be done too frequently, nor without a plan; its place is confined to the three feet of the cesura; but may be different for the sake of expression. Take the following as instances of happy pauses and the contrary.

Wild sparkling rage inflames the hermit's eyes;
He bursts the bands of fear, and madly cries
Detested wretch!—But scarce his speech began
When the strange partner seem'd no longer man.

His steps the youth pursues; the country lay
Perplex'd with roads; a servant shew'd the way.
A river cross'd the path; the passage o'er
Was nice to find; the servant trod before.

But 5thly, the principal instrument of harmony is the cesural pause. Much of the charm of verse would be wanting if lines were uniformly divided. Witness the following from Pope when recited as marked; which however is not doing them just-

tice, and one line is a little altered to preserve the monotony.

A soul as full—of worth, as void of pride,
Which nothing seeks—to shew or needs to hide:
Which nor to guilt—nor fear, its caution owes,
And boasts a warmth—which from no passion flows.
A face untaught—to feign; a judging eye
That darts severe—upon a rising lie,
And strikes a blush—through frontless flattery. }
All this thou wert—and being this before
Fortune and kings—can never make thee more.
Then scorn to gain—a friend by servile ways,
Nor wish to lose—a foe these virtues raise.

How preferable are these varied warblings of the same poet!

Ye sacred Nine—that all my soul possesses,
Whose raptures fire me,—and whose visions bless,
Bear me, oh bear me—to sequester'd scenes,
To bowery mazes--and furrounding greens,
To Thames's banks--which fragrant breezes fill,
Or where ye muses--sport on Cooper's hill:
On Cooper's hill--eternal wreaths shall grow,
While lasts the mountain--or while Thames shall flow.

Here, as in the instances of various feet, we have not only the pleasure of change, but the higher delight arising from proportion. Readers of taste, though unversed in the *science* of numbers, will remember having dwelt with pleasure on the mere sound of passages like this. The traces of these delightful movements frequently remain in the mind, and serve as a kind of inspiration, allowing them no rest till they have filled up the craving void of these blanks of harmony with compositions of their own. The varied and yet regular maze affords numberless objects of comparison, which to perceive is unspeakably pleasant, though to point them out minutely might seem tedious. Nay, as was before remarked on the *melody* of pauses, pleasure may be derived from a view of straight lines in the same variety and proportion. The diagram below fails to affect us with the sense, pathos, or melody of poetic compositions; but is consequently more confined to those properties I am describing, so I have reserved the minute observations to be applied to it. Besides, every ear or eye cannot discover the proportions and varieties in the verse without such assistance.



Here we first observe the uniformity of the entire lines, which are exactly equal. Then the cesural division, in which, though we are best pleased with the equal lines, we do not regret the intermixture of unequal ones, but find our delight heightened by the variety they introduce. We next divide the whole into two equal parts of four lines; we observe their similarity in quantity, yet their dissimilarity in movement: we compare the great uniformity of the first course with the great variety of the second. We then divide each of the courses into two parts, forming four divisions, and these again afford other comparisons. The dissimilarity of the two first is now compared with the similarity of the two last; the similarity of the first and last with the similarity of the two middle. But to point out every comparison that obtrudes is less pleasant than to observe them in passing. Then the mind glances over the whole with a rapidity that enhances the delight; and the more as we suppose many other proportions still unperceived. But eight lines may be graced with many different yet proportional movements; and courses may consist of any even number of lines above two. The intermixture of verses of the third order will greatly multiply the possible sorts of combination.

Still fairer prospects open into Parnassus, when we consider the farther division of lines, by two pauses, or by three, termed demicefuras thus —

And sweet--reluctant--amorous delay,

From storms--a shelter--and from heat--a shade.

This subdivision will introduce new objects of comparison, will make single lines capable of a varied harmony in themselves, and highly musical in skilful combinations. The finest verses will be those in which two or more demicefuras are equal, as

From men--their cities--and from gods--their fanes.

Reason—the card—but passion—is the gale.

Thus sitting—thus consulting—thus in arms.

When the portions are unequal, the best are those in which the larger are placed latest, thus

Pants—on her neck—and fans—her parting hair.

It is evident that the power of harmony and of comparison must very much increase by this subdivision when considered with respect to long courses. The following quotation, with the sub-

joined figure shewing its cesuras and demicesuras, will suggest the greater part of the remarks which are proper on this occasion, and tend to confirm many previous observations on harmony.

Of humbler mien, but not of mortal race,
 Ill-fated Dryden, with imperial grace,
 Gives to th'obedient lyre his rapid laws;
 Tones yet unheard, with touch divine, he draws,
 The melting fall, the rising swell sublime,
 And all the magic of melodious rhyme.
 See with proud joy imagination spread
 A wreath of honour round his aged head!
 But two base spectres, though of different hue,
 The bard unhappy in his march pursue;
 Two vile disgraceful fiends of race accurst,
 Conceiv'd by Spleen, by meagre Famine nurs't;
 Malignant Satire, mercenary Praise,
 Shed their dark spots on his immortal bays. *Hayley.*



Another thing which is much noticed by some critics, as adding to the harmony of the verse, is the chief accent. This is generally placed upon the end of the second foot, as

Godlike, unmov'd,—and yet, like woman, kind.

But in fact it is always the next syllable, or next but one, before the pause. It therefore admits all the variety of the pause; and in subdivided verses there are several strong accents.

It may be proper, before entering on our brief view of *EXPRESSION*, to remark that the powers of verse to convey ideas by its sound have been disputed by some philologists, and much narrowed by others. A late eminent critic* has confined their

* *Dr. Johnson's Lives of the English Poets.*

whole effect to the imitation of sound and motion. More accurate or more successful examination has discovered, that it can at least agree to various other things, though chiefly by their analogy to these.

Verses composed of the trochee are most suitable to gay or cheerful subjects, as

Health ! to thee thy votry owes
All the blessings life bestows,
All the sweets the summer yields,
Gardens gay and clover'd fields.

Iambics, especially where the accented syllables are long, express the tender passions with keenness.

Then too, when fate shall thy fair frame destroy
(That cause of all my guilt and all my joy)
From opening skies may streaming glories shine,
And saints embrace thee with a love like mine.

And the anapaest those that are impetuous and extreme.

O ye woods, spread your branches apace ;
To your deepest recesses I fly ;
I would hide with the beasts of the chase ;
I would vanish from every eye.

The amphibrachic is best adapted to the comic style.

The sparrow and linnet will feed from your hand
Grow tame by your kindness and come at command.
Exert with your husband the same happy skill,
For hearts like your birds may be tam'd to your will.

The spondee introduced among others will convey a notion of solemnity or slowness; the pyrrhic and tribrach of lightness; the dactyl of swift motion. The iambic measures, moderately lightened by a mixture of other feet, and the spondees tempered with pyrrhics, are most proper for narrative.

Many singular expressions of sentiment by sound can be reduced to no rule : they are happy efforts of genius.

When loud surges lash the sounding shore,
The hoarse rough verse should like the torrent roar.

The moon,
Rising in clouded majesty, at length,
Apparent Queen ! unveil'd her peerless light,
And o'er the dark her silver mantle threw.

Where heaves the turf in many a mouldering heap.

The cesural pause is confined to its three proper seats, only as it respects melody and harmony. For expression it may take place at any part of the verse whatever. But it must amply repay in the last quality its deficiencies in the first, and must not occur too

frequently. —To justify very unequal divisions, it must appear that the larger part or preceding line required continuity, as
 Now in loose garlands thick thrown off, the bright
 Pavement—that like a sea of jasper shone,
 Impurpled with celestial roses smil'd.

Or that the smaller balances in weight of sentiment, the superior quantity of the other,

His wrath—which one day will destroy you both.

Day—or the sweet approach of even or morn.

When the idea of continued motion is conveyed, or the sense is suspended, the pause has the best effect on the middle of the foot, as

———— To right and left the front

Divided—and to either flank retir'd.

When the sense is completed, or the idea of finished motion conveyed, the pause on the complete foot expresses it best, as
 Some such resemblances methinks I find

Of our last evening's talk in this thy dream,

But with addition strange:—yet be not sad.

All kinds of Stanza do not equally agree with all subjects. Short lines, in regular measures and frequent returns, are fittest for the delicate effusions of love and friendship. The pentameter quatrain is congenial to plaintive and descriptive pieces. Jests and jovial sentiments demand numbers composed of tri-syllabic feet. The celebration of great characters, magnificent objects, and sublime events is best performed in swelling, vast, and unequal verses. As to the paragraphed poetry—all long pieces, and almost all narratives are thrown into this form. For light and jocular matters the tetrameters of mixed feet; for middle subjects the heroic; and for the grandest and most solemn the blank verse, have been esteemed most suitable.

DISSERTATION XIII.

ON READING AND DELIVERY.

Nihil potest intrare in affectum, quod in aure, velut quodam vestibulo
 statim offendit. *Quintilian.*

Articulation, pronunciation, and accent, the bases of a good delivery, have already been noticed. There remain proper *emphases, pauses, tones, time, looks, and gestures.*

Those who have treated these subjects best have as yet produced little beyond the simple direction—"Follow nature." This is perfectly just indeed, but scarce merits the name of a

rule; because all men of sense keep this constantly in view, whatever they undertake; and because perverse habits are generally mistaken, by those they enslave, for nature itself. The proper way to have perfected this most pleasing of all arts, was to have attended to the striking methods of the most celebrated geniuses—Booth, Garrick, Mrs. Cibber, and Mrs. Siddons, on the stage—Foster and Farmer in the pulpit—Erskine, Pitt, Sheridan, at the bar and in the senate; to have observed what in them charmed and triumphed; to have extended, by philosophical research, the same principles; and to have fixed the whole upon stable grounds by corresponding marks clearly explained. Two or three writers indeed, among whom the names of Steele and T. Sheridan are conspicuous, have made considerable advances upon this plan. This essay cannot carry the subject even so far as they have done. Carefully to collect, and clearly to state, leading principles already discovered, is all this multifarious undertaking can effect.

EMPHASIS, then, is a stress of voice, accompanied by a change of tone, upon those words in any sentence that are most important. In polysyllables the stress and change naturally fall on the accented syllable. All emphases are not alike: the stress being proportioned to the degree of importance, and the change regulated by the accompanying emotions. The man of acute sensations and lively perceptions, having a previous knowledge of what he utters, laying aside all studied tunes, and attending to the sense and relative importance of every word, will not poise them amiss. But because ill habits must be corrected by reason, not capricious taste; because principles in every art are desirable; a few rules for emphasis shall be set down—by no means a complete system, though such a one might be framed by long, careful, and patient investigation. 1. Substantives and verbs have more emphasis, *ceteris paribus*, than articles, pronouns, prepositions, and conjunctions; as, He killed the bird with a stone and gathered it. 2. Adjectives and adverbs have in general more than they; as, He DEXTEROUSLY killed the POOR bird with a LITTLE stone, and INSTANTLY gathered it. 3. Words when newly introduced have often a stronger emphasis than when repeated. 4. Words that are opposed have a very heavy emphasis, as You do not READ, you SING. 5. The accent is frequently changed by the emphasis in a word compounded with a negative preposition; as, He was happy, though she was unhappy. 6. Emphatic words often depend upon an opposition understood. 7. The same sentence may assume many different significations, and the same question require many different answers according to the seat of the emphasis. Dr. Blair instan-

ces in "Betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss"? The emphasis on *betrayest* makes the reproach turn on the infamy of treachery; on *thou* rests it on Judas's situation; on *Son of man* grounds it on Jesus's character; on *kiss* brings to view the signal of peace and friendship prostituted to purposes of destruction.

In teaching, sentences should be proposed, and the emphatic word demanded; then they should be pronounced both right and wrong, and the wrong ones detected. Passages should be marked for the pupils' reading, and at length by themselves. Such methods would give them both judgement and facility.

Where stops are placed PAUSES must always be held; and, in general, less for the less stops, and greater for the greater. But pauses are often required, where none of the four stops should be placed, and the relative time of the pauses at stops is inaccurately determined. Hence if a person counts as he reads, a disgusting stiffness will infest his manner. The grammatical stops are confined to pointing out the construction. There are certain unmarked pauses,—First to shew what words are intimately connected with that on which the emphasis lies; as, Custom is the plague of wise men and the idol of fools. This is almost imperceptible, scarce allowing time for inhaling breath.—2ndly, To give an opportunity of changing the tone or height, as

Or whether Heaven has doom'd—that Shock must fall.

O solid bliss! which nothing can destroy

Except—a cat, bird, snail, or idle boy.

3rdly, To prepare the audience for a striking emphasis, or something remarkable or unexpected. 4thly, The final and cesural pauses in verse, longer than the common pause of emphasis, yet shorter than the comma. The observance of these pauses is the only difference between reading verse and prose. The fictions which some propagate about *favouring the metre*, and *favouring the rhyme* are nonsensical. Let poets take care to need no favour; but, by sedulous application to correctness, give the world such verses, that they may esteem as the highest favour, strict propriety in reading, both of pronunciation and emphasis.

It has been a rule that the voice must be dropt, a little at the semicolon, more at the colon, and to the lowest at a period; that it should be elevated, or at least suspended at a comma. But this has introduced a stiff, uniform tune which a certain author has very properly condemned under the title of *the reading brogue*. The best token of the ending of a sentence is an easy smart expression of the last accented syllable. The height of voice should be wholly regulated by the meaning of the words. If this be the case, the endless variety of heights, at which the voice will rest at the close of sentences, will both delight the

ear, and contribute to inform the intellect, and rouse the feelings.

It may not be amiss here to intimate the propriety of laying in breath at the larger stops; and let it be done gently, so that neither motion nor noise on that account can be perceived. Readers there are, that have but two rules for stopping—they pause at every word of above two syllables to see what it is; and every time they are out of breath to take in more. Whoever would read so as to please or profit the hearers, should always peruse a sentence or two and glance over the whole previous to any utterance, and afterwards keep the eye considerably before the voice. This will not only prevent that awkward hesitation at particular words, but enable them to adapt the emphasis, the pause, and the tone, most exactly, to the subject. Public discourses should not be repeated from the book, but from memory; and as a preparation for that, frequent recitation should be practised, which will greatly excite the powers of delivery.

No infallible rules have as yet been laid down for the minute expressions of sentiment by TONES. Unimpassioned reasoning, plain narrative, and cool description require the tenor voice; dreadful and stormy passions are expressed by the bass; and the gentler, more pleasurable feelings by the treble.

Loudness or lowness of tone has no connexion with the subject, but only with the place and circumstances of the auditors. We speak loud to deaf persons, and to crowded extensive assemblies; but in an easy, moderated tone, a little above a whisper, in other circumstances. The orator should fix his eye, frequently, on the remotest of his audience; and when he perceives no strained listening, let him keep to that pitch. In reading a proclamation or menacing speech to a fireside circle, some employ the voice of Stentor. On their principles, the canvass, on which a landscape is drawn, should contain as many square yards as the view it represents.

With respect to TIME the first direction is—TAKE TIME ENOUGH. The general fault of an uncorrected reader is extreme hurry. Even those that cannot read without hesitation, gallop where they conceive it plain; and stammer it out when obstructed. It is safer to settle at that speed which one's friend or tutor thinks just too slow. It must be quickened indeed on particular occasions where swift motion, excited rage or active valour are described. Variety of time as well as tone is necessary, in order to please; but it should be natural, not the effect of whim or affectation. Some acquire a velocity in speaking as a heavy body in falling; an absurd habit, to be corrected whatever expence or trouble it may require.

LOOK and GESTURE are still less under the dominion of precept. For though pretty regular accounts have been given of the outward marks of internal emotions, they can perhaps never be practically assumed from these descriptions, either with sufficient rapidity, accuracy, or simplicity. To men in general we must say "Be in earnest when your character is real: fancy yourself "so when it is assumed, and nature will do the rest". But to some, who are too full of antic and grimace, we must add, "Be "modest. Excessive gesticulation and distorted features can only call up disgust". To others, a timid class, we must say, "Throw off that pernicious bashfulness, cautious reserve, and "cool unconcern. Suffer those affections which God has implanted in your minds to be impressed with your subject. "And when emotions arise, and would discover themselves in "your countenance and gestures, do not repress them. At least "let them steal out by degrees, if you cannot venture on a sudden alteration. You cannot please unless you move. You "cannot move without being moved yourself. It will not be "thought that you are moved if you so sedulously repress every "appearance of it".

Various awkward, offensive habits are to be overcome, in most persons, before their appearance will be tolerably easy. Contracted brows, strained muscles, and distorted features, first caused by the difficulty of rapid reading—a settled frown, half-closed eyes, or a ghastly stare—absurd beating of time—a uniform waver of the body—a formal or embarrassed attitude—with one or all of these, most are in some degree infested. Nothing in these cases is so beneficial as the private admonitions of a faithful friend. The polite accomplishment of dancing, too, has often a good effect on the mien and movement; and an attention to those orators, who are celebrated for that in which we are defective, will be a powerful stimulus, an invaluable aid.

DISSERTATION XIV.

ON DERIVATION.

Cet art est principalement recommandable en ce qu'il fournit à la philosophie des matériaux et des observations pour élever le grand édifice de la théorie générale des langues.

Présid. de Broffes.

That some words are formed from others has already sufficiently appeared. It is difficult to fix upon any of our words and say—This is pure underived English. Those we have received from the Anglo-saxon are reckoned most indigenous. We find amongst linguists and lexicographers sufficient quarrels about

the origin of particular terms. Two mistakes have prevailed respecting derivation. Fancy has been busy where evidence only should have decided; and words of which the collaterals are in several languages have been derived from that in which they are not most native. We are indeed frequently ignorant whether a word be truly radical and aboriginal in the most antient stock to which we can trace it; and also from what stock the first borrower transplanted it: but our necessary ignorance on these points should not prevent us from concluding according to the clearest proof.

Agreement in spelling, or existing monuments of deduction, form the only certain proof; but spelling may not always be an infallible guide, as a perverse or whimsical etymologist may torture it to a different sense in many instances*. There is no end of the ridiculous derivations which may be framed by attending to sound only; witness Swift's very humorous remarks on the antiquity of the English tongue†.

In compound words the order is frequently reversed, and sometimes one or more particles to be supplied. Sometimes the sense is totally changed as in *understand*; and sometimes partially as in *remove*. Very many derivatives retain only their metaphorical sense. So *spiritus Lat.* signifies breath literally, metaphorically *mind* and some other things; but *spirit* is never used for breath. This is a confirmation of that theory of speech, which supposes all words however abstracted, to be derived from objects perceptible by the senses. Etymology, soberly employed, furnishes the best explanation of these words, as by discovering the literal sense of the original term it limits the analogy.

Some English words, as *humble* and *humility*, were derived from the same foreign root, but at different times, and with different degrees of accuracy.

The greatest part of Latin and Greek compounds, and our derivatives from them, are not formed of the entire words, but of the radical parts or of oblique cases; most of our compounds of English are entire, as *schoolmaster*, *winepress*: yet we have a class, which, from long use, have dropped some letters; and their origin is not evident without greater attention, such as *walnut*, *welcome*.

Compound words, when euphonious and regular, are of value to any language. They add to its energy, conciseness, and versability. Yet a writer, especially a young one, by em-

* The Hebrew and Greek chi are spelled by ch sounded hard; the Greek cappa by c, phy, by ph, and psi by ps. † In which he derives *Moses* from *mow seas*, &c.

ploying too many novel compounds, runs the hazard of being thought fantastical, assuming, or ignorant. He may avail himself of what are previously authorized, but coin sparingly, and with great attention to analogy and sound*. Relations being implied in these words they are not always sufficiently definite†. So *milkmaid* might signify *a maid selling or fetching milk*.

In the English, as well as in other languages, the relation of meaning, in many words, not avowedly derivatives, is indicated by a relation of sound. A like affinity runs through numbers of words in several tongues, but has a considerable effect in ours through the frequency of consonants. Wallis, and after him the President de Brosles and others, have delivered a regular system of the connection between certain sounds and certain ideas. *bl* denotes breathing, as in *blow, blast, blight, bluster*; *str* great power or effort, as *strong, strike, struggle*; *st* fixity or a kind of negative inert power, as *stand, stay, staff*; *thr* violent motion, as *throw, thrust, throng, throb*; *wr* (in which the *w* has doubtless been pronounced) distortion, as *wry, wrestle, wrong*; *sw* silent agitation, or gentle lateral motion, as *sway, sweep, swim*; *sm* much the same, perhaps rather more brisk, as *smite, smack*; *sl* the same but more imperceptible, as *slide, sling, slip, slur*; *cl* tenacity or glutinosity, *cleave, clay, cling, clammy*; *sp* dissipation or expansion, as *spill, spit*, especially with *r*, as *spread, sprout, sprinkle*. The termination *asb*, indicates a loud and sudden fall or stroke, as *crash, clasp, plash*; *usb* a duller one but with a continued sound, as *rush, gush*; *ing* a continued chime, as *ding, ring*; *ink* a chime terminating suddenly, as *tink, clink, chink*; *le* after a consonant, frequency or iteration, as *jingle, tinkle, jangle, rumble, amble*.

Sometimes several ideas are denoted by several letters in the same word; as in *sparkle*, *sp* is dissipation, *ar* lively appearance, *k* sudden termination, and *le*, after a consonant, frequent iteration. Sometimes this obtains even in a monosyllable, as in *smart*; where *sm* indicates silence in the beginning, *ar* sudden and lively effort, and *t* immediate discontinuation.

In other words, where there is not this significant sound, we have still a remote analogy indicating relation, though the etymology is not clear or certain. As, *beat, bat, battle, beetle, batter*; and *two, twain, twice, twenty, twelve, twins, twine, twist, twirl, between, betwixt, twilight, twibil*.

Dr. Wallis discovers composition of terms, where one would

* Pope, *Pref. to the Iliad*. Blair. † *Qui tamen multo distinctius, ubi illud requiritur, per prepositiones exprimitur.* Wallisii Gram. cap. 5.

not at first view suspect it. *Scroll*, he says, is from *scrip* (writing) and *roll*; *prance* from *proud* and *dance*; *flout* from *flay out*; *sturdy* from *flout* and *hardy*; *spout* from *spew out*; *sprout* from *spring out*; *gruff* from *grave* and *rough*; and *trudge* from *tread* and *drudge*.

DISSERTATION XV.

ON THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF WORDS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL.

B. But you have not all this while informed me how many *Parts of Speech* you mean to lay down, *H.* That shall be as you please. Either *two* or *twenty*, or more. In the strict sense of the term, no doubt both the necessary words and the abbreviations are all of them parts of speech.

Diversions of Parley.

We have before limited the necessary kinds of words to two, the substantive and assertive; but have described the invention of other more abstracted terms, the grammatical accidents of which, and their mutual relations in construction, make them to be considered by the practical grammarian as species separate and distinct. The transcendental grammarian, indeed, may constantly advert to the necessary division, to solve difficulties and settle disputes; but in all science names are given to objects according to those differences which concern the business in hand. Those frugal writers who start with informing us that there are only four parts of speech*, while their enumeration contains double the necessary number, do still make them nine by their subdivisions. Thus they want the conciseness and accuracy of the natural distinction, and the comprehensiveness, aptness, and utility of the artificial. They direct too the attention of their pupils to sense instead of construction. Their terms also, while they appear to be popular words, bear a technical sense. Who, but an innovating grammarian, ever called *I* a name, or *twenty* a quality?

In practical systems a novel term presents all the formidable appearance of a new and arduous task, while it diminishes confidence in what has been previously learnt†. Now the greatest authorities have some weight in establishing customs. Hence

* According to *Hermes* substantives, attributives; definitives, and connectives. In the different distribution and plainer style of *Fisher* and some others, names, qualities, affirmations and particles.

† It is on this ground that I would not have the varying systems and vocabularies of different authors introduced during the first tour of the art. When the mind is fixed it may be not only harmless but beneficial.

an additional motive for adopting the ninefold division of language; the authority of our great Lowth, followed by three of our most respectable grammarians, and differing but trivially from several others not less respectable, urges with considerable force. In number and name I have not altered his statement*. I have differed in order for a reason shortly to be explained.

The *Article* is constantly set before the substantive, nobody having ever thought of writing *man the* or *woman a*†. But it is not always *immediately* before, they admitting between them adjectives or participles, and adverbs affecting either of these; as, a *very wise* (or *thinking*) man. It belongs to the substantive only, or words used as substantives, and ever implies one somewhere following. It limits the signification; *a* or *an* with respect to number, *the* with regard to the circumstance of being known. These three words are reckoned as articles because of their frequent recurrence, their remarkable difference, and their peculiar accidents. Certain adjectives, as *this*, *that*, *any*, *some*, *all*, &c. and the cardinal numbers, contain a definitive or limiting power. See notes on r. 255, 287.

A *substantive* or name (for the latter is but a familiar term for the former) may be defined with precision, A term used to recal the idea of some real or supposed substance. Diff. ii. The more antient word *noun* (derived from the Latin *nomen*) is nearly obsolete, and to many conveys a wrong idea. That the adjective or property may more determinately coalesce with its own substance, or the name of its possessor, it has, in the Latin language, the same number of cases, and has a different set of these for each of the three genders; whence the terminations and inflexions of the two agree, and the grammarians have included both under the general title of noun; subdividing it into noun substantive and noun adjective. But the English substantive and adjective are quite distinct. To reckon them distinct species then, which in the other language would not be amiss,

* Perhaps I should not be much thanked for the treat, were I to tell how many parts of speech were reckoned by Aristotle, Theodectes, Aristarchus, Dio, Varro, and seven or eight other ancients, all different. Nor how many the contradictory statements of our modern writers make. Those who would know may find it in Sanctii Minerva, lib. i. cap. 2. Quinctiliani Instit. Orator. lib. i. cap. 4. Harris, Hermes book i. chap. 3. Diversions of Purley, near the beginning; and the English grammars. It is said that upwards of thirty parts have been enumerated. † See vol. i, rule 245. The Arabic language is said to have a termination of equivalent use to our article.

in ours becomes absolutely necessary, if any kind of distinction be so.

The *pronoun** recalls the idea of substances not absolutely but relatively. Their real meaning is to be traced to the general and abstract notions of person, being, and thing; thus, *I* the person now speaking; *thou* the person now addressed; *he* the male being before named; *she* the female being before named; *it* the being of none or indeterminate sex; *we* I and persons associated; *you* thou and persons associated, *they* the persons or things before named. The construction of the pronoun in most languages occasions considerable trouble.

The *adjective*† has its name from being placed *with* or *added to* the substantive. In construction it occasions little or no trouble. It has no inflexions but those that denote comparison.

There is not a word of greater consequence, of more complex nature, more various inflexion, or more difficult construction than the *verb*‡. Its distinguishing characteristic is to assert. Not that this kind of word contains the force of assertion in every form or position. But that word which may obtain this force by being anywise varied or placed is a verb.

Prepositions have their name from being set before other words||. They connect, but in a different way from conjunctions. The latter join sentences or similar words; the former always connect single words, and those dissimilar. They likewise denote some relation, generally of place in their literal sense, but are adapted to others by figures of speech.

The *adverb* is of late invention in language; for it is a contraction of a phrase composed of three and sometimes of four words of different kinds, as stated in vol. i. rule 251. A preposition being one is the reason why that part is placed before adverbs in the enumeration. Adverbs in the learned languages have great affinity with the oblique cases of adjectives, substantives being understood, as in *continuo*; and in the English are generally compounds of adjectives with some word originally signifying way or manner, the preposition being understood. It takes its name from being frequently joined to a verb, to which it seems to bear the same respect or proportion as the adjective to the substantive. Prepositions change into adverbs when their object is omitted.

Some have contended that *conjunctions*§ always connect sentences; that when they appear to join single words those may

* Lat. pro for; and nomen name. † Ad to; and jacio throw or cast. ‡ Verbum, word. || From pre before; and pono, posui, positum, to put or place. § From con together; and jungo to join.

be formed into sentences by supplying what is understood. Thus, "Peter, James, and John, went into the temple"—means "Peter went into the temple : James went into the temple : John went into the temple". But some unlucky instances cross this general solution. "Two and three make five". Can one say, with such extreme propriety, "Two makes five—Three makes five?" "The lines A B, B C, and C A form a triangle. John and Jane are a happy couple. Saul and Paul were the same person. I bought this book for two shillings and sixpence". To make these and similar instances comport with the definition I have added to "sentences"—"similar words."

As *interjections** are significant sounds, that occur both in speech and writing, I see no reason to exclude them from the character of words. Being natural effusions, they acknowledge no rule, and require little investigation.

With respect to the useful subdivisions, we reckon two kinds of articles, definite and indefinite. The distinction, as in article 255 with the note, is very plain and satisfactory.

There are two sorts of substantives, the proper and common, art. 259. The abstracted range under the distinction of common, Diff. ii. Some learners are apt to confound the distinction of proper and common, with the logical one of genus and species. They should be shewn that proper names are by no means relative, but absolutely affixed to individuals. They should likewise have series of words proposed, beginning at the highest genus, and descending to the individual; as *Being, creature, animal, man, George*.

It seems to me right to divide pronouns into four classes, the *personal, indefinite, interrogative, and relative*. The personal is that which is simply put for a name without any farther power, except that of pointing out the speaker, the person addressed, or a third person. *I, thou, &c.* The indefinite stands for some person or thing without determining which, as *whoever, whatever*; the interrogative for some person or thing the subject of enquiry, as *who? which?* and the *relative* stands instead of a personal pronoun and the same idea of relation that is expressed by the preposition of; as "The man *who* is virtuous, or the man *of* virtue, will be respected". See Encyclopedia Britannica art. Grammar.

I see little or no necessity for subdivision in adjectives. Some writers mention *numeral* and *ordinal* which the reader of vol. i. will understand; *Possessive* as national, human†, formal; *Respective*

* Inter between; and jacio to throw. † Dr. Wallis styles the possessive case an adjective possessive.

the substantive itself placed adjectively, as a *sea fish*, more frequently made a part of a compound substantive; and *material* denoting the matter of which a thing is formed, and commonly terminating with —*en*.

Verbs in regard to their importance are *principal* and *auxiliary* vol. i. art. 301. In regard to their inflexion they are *regular*, varying by one general rule; and *irregular* as in art. 297. Also they are *perfect* wanting none of their modes or tenses, and *defective* wanting some of them, as in art. 301, 314. With respect to their subject, they have been divided into *personal* and *impersonal*. The latter have been supposed to have no nominative case or subject but of the third person singular. They were apparently without nominative in Latin, but in English have the neuter pronoun, art. 271. This, however, though a common, is but a putative distinction; as we can suppose the atmosphere to speak and say *I snow* or *rain*; and so in other instances. With respect to their objects they are divided into *active*, *passive*, and *neuter*, art. 207, 208.

Prepositions have in general escaped all divisions, but adverbs have been distinguished into those of *time*, *place*, *number*, *asking*, *affirming*, *denying*, *quality*, *quantity*, *comparison*, &c. conjunctions into *copulatives*, *disjunctives*, *discretives*, *causals*, *conditionals*, *exceptives*, *interrogatives*, *illatives*, *adversatives*, *electives*, *diminutives*, and by some authors into numerous classes besides. But as every useful purpose of these divisions is answered by allowing what are called particles to have a meaning, and then explaining that meaning according to the best authors, I have totally overpast them all except the practical distinction of copulatives and disjunctives; art. 328, 329.

DISSERTATION XVI.

ON NUMBERS, GENDERS, CASES, AND PERSONS.

Number, as it pertains to grammar, is only the distinction between one and more; a distinction, 'tis probable, nearly coeval with language itself. Some of the antient languages had, beside the *singular* and *plural*, a difference in some of the words, signifying or connected with two things only, and termed the *dual*. We have something of like nature in vol. i. rule 286 case 2. and in the preposition *between*, *betwixt*.

The easy method of forming the plural of substantives may be learned from art. 262—265. The antient languages were more operose and perplexing in this point. The Latin has five,

different terminations for the plural nominative only, and these regulated by difficult rules. The plural in pronouns is a totally different word, on which account it has been contended that this part of speech is undeclined. Our adjectives have nothing to do with this property, except the few in r. 287. Verbs cannot be said to *have* the singular or plural number, but only to *agree* with either. Hence the peculiar phraseology of r. 296. The ancient characteristic termination of the plurals (note on r. 296) frequently occurs in Chaucer, "Thei *bolden* hertes of men in usage, but thei ne deliver no folke fro maladie".—"Ye *withdrowen* fro me this man, that hath been nourished in my studies". It is still current in the rustic speech. "Truth on honesty, gooink hont eh hont, *hored'n* one another's back prime-ly." *Lanc. Dial.*

In cases our substantives are scanty, having only two, *nominative* and *possessive*; or, according to the hypercritical distinction of some, only one, the name of case having been denied to the nominative. We supply the other cases of the antient tongues by particles, position, and pointing. Those grammarians, therefore, are guilty of occasioning both waste of time and confusion of ideas, that obstinately retain, in English grammar, the names of the six Latin cases. I do not see but there are as properly five declensions in English as six cases*. The pronoun adds an *objective* case similar in use to the Latin accusative; and its possessives are double, relative and absolute†. It has been conjectured that the different words for the same pronoun have been analogously derived from distinct roots, now obsolete; and purposely varied to prevent a disagreeable sameness in a class of terms so much used. Alterations analogous to cases are made, in some languages, by prefixing letters: we have nothing of this kind in English, unless we reckon such ellisions as *b'itself*, *i' Alexander*. Even these make it probable, notwithstanding the contrary sentiment of some learned men, that the casual terminations may have been small unemphatical words, which, at the commencement of the practice of writing, were confounded with their principals. Adjectives, in English, have no cases.

Gender is a distinction, which, though it originates in the substance named, affects only the pronoun of the third person. This always agrees with the sex of the name to which it refers. Sometimes the sex is only a supposed and allegorical one, art. 270. In this case we do not make it male or female at pleasure,

* For the origin of the *possessive*, see the note on art. 266.

† These answer to the French *le notre*, &c. and have a beautiful effect in construction.

but take the usual and authorized gender. So nobody in England would call the sun *she* or the church *he*. There seems to be something in some of the objects themselves analogous to that sex with which we class them. Yet many languages call those feminines that we call masculines, and *vice versâ*. The moon in the Anglo-saxon was masculine, and was painted with the face of a man*. Several northern nations made the sun feminine, and their mythology reckoned that luminary to be the wife of Tuisco†. Countries and nations are generally feminine, but in the scriptures are frequently masculine, from their earliest inhabitant or first founder‡; and it is said the Germans have them always neuter. Even the grim and all-commanding tyrant is in French *la mort*—of the feminine gender.

The instances just adduced will prevent our entertaining an excessive fondness for systems of the natural reason of the figurative gender. In our language it may generally be traced either to the Grecian fable, or the Hebrew poetry. In other cases it must be referred to that strange custom in the ancient languages of reckoning genders by the termination of the word||, which is now made more strange by the French and Italians, who account all inanimate things either masculine or feminine.

How much preferable is the glorious simplicity of the English, which except in the adduced cases follows nature alone! And even in the figurative instances how superior is our language! In those others a word continues its assumed gender in every connexion, and in every style; while in this the poet or impassioned orator can personify the object he describes; can continue the figure by means of the attributed gender as long as he pleases; and when it is proper to descend to the sober style of unadorned reason, can again consider the object as it really exists§.

The utility of some distinction for the Genders, in the third person singular of pronouns, will be cheerfully allowed by any one that will try a few times to do without them: that will suppose himself for instance obliged to say, "Thais occasioned Alexander to ruin Persepolis; *it* caused *it* to destroy *it* by fire".

The distinction of persons originates in the circumstances of the subject of discourse; occasions the use of different pronouns; and alters the termination of the verb. The ordinals first, second, and third are applied here clearly according to the

* *Spellman's Glossary*, MONA. † *Hickes, Vossius*. ‡ See *Hofea xi, I. xii, I.* || Perhaps first introduced because many real or figurative masculines or feminines ended alike respectively. Priestly, *Lecture xiii.* § *Hermes, book i. c. 4. note (i).*

proximity of the subject to the speaker. The verb with all our plural persons remains the same as the first person singular—another striking example of simplicity, other languages having the three plural persons various, and different from the first person singular.*

DISSERTATION XVII.

ON COMPARISON.

Comparison, the only variation that takes place in English adjectives, is an accident not hard to be understood. The termination of the comparative *-er*, is equivalent in meaning to the adverb *more*—or the phrase, in a greater degree—or in a degree exceeding some other: that of the superlative *-est* to the adverb *most*—or the phrase, in the greatest degree—or in a degree exceeding all other. So that they are contractions of contractions; adapted like most grammatical contrivances to facilitate the progress of speech.

Words compared by *er* and *est* will likewise take the adverbs instead of those terminations. For an abbreviated method of expressing an idea cannot make the fuller method improper, when harmony or superior emphasis requires it.

The rule which denies the comparing terminations to polysyllables, and some dissyllables, has its foundation in euphony. In polysyllables to annex the termination would either change the seat of the accent, or throw it to a disagreeable distance from the end. A few dissyllables beside those licensed in art. 282, would preserve a tolerable sound when regularly compared; but with the particle *more* they sound equally well; and

** In a series of notes on this dissertation, I had attempted to give the mere English reader an idea of the Latin construction, and its numerous prerequisites. They are however, through the overflow of necessary materials omitted for the present. It concluded with the following sentence, exhibited as in the lower translation; and by a similar method, all the principal accidents of the Roman speech were illustrated.*

*Doctrina sed vim promovet insitam,
Rectique cultus pectora roborant.*

Hor.

TRANSLATION. But learning advances native power, and right precepts strengthen minds.

LATIN ENDINGS AND POSITION. *Learninga but powerim advanceat nativam, righti and preceptus minda strengthenant.*

therefore are confined to it in compliance with the rule. Dr. Johnson, indeed allowed the regular comparifon to all diffyllables, with the exception of about eighteen endings.

Other comparifons take place befide what are commonly called the degrees, as *very wife, moderately wife, lefs wife, leaft wife, a little wife*; but they have no appropriate terminations, except indeed the laft, which has fometimes *-if* inelegantly, as *wifef*, *goodif*. Something equivalent to *er* and *eft* has been employed in moft languages*.

The rule that forbids two figns of the fame degree is a plain confequence from the fimple principal of avoiding tautology.

Participial verbs, and adverbs, are equally fufceptible of comparifon with adjectives; and their variations and irregularities are to be accounted for upon the fame principles. Other parts indeed may ludicrously admit of it; but then they are ludicrously confidered as adjectives. It is thus that the Punior of Plautus may be accounted for, which means, adjectively, a more Carthaginian fellow; one poffeffing more of the language of a Carthaginian†.

DISSERTATION XVIII.

ON MODES.

Inclinationes animi varia confequitur declinatio verbi.

Prifcian.

Were we to reckon as a different mode, every different ufe of the verb, we fhould have a confiderable number befide the five modes of art. 291. As 1. The primary mode or original ftate. 2. The dative mode, when the action of the verb is the caufe or end of fomething before it, as I rejoice to hear. This was formerly preceded by the prepoftion *for*. 3. The precative mode—"Save thy people, O Lord";—differing from the imperative as entreaty from command. 4. The fubftantive mode, or gerund; the verb ufed as a fubftantive, but like the participle in termination. "Lying is an odious vice". 5. The in-

* *The childifh enquiry whether the pofitive be a degree is, like another in the laft differtation, not worth the labour. It certainly contains no comparifon. For other remarks that might be expected here, fee art. 282—285 with their notes.*

† Milphio. *Quid tu ais tu?* Agorastocles. *Quid vis.*

Mil. *Vin' appellem hunc Punice?* Agor. *An feis?*

Mil. *Nullus me eft hodie* POENUS PUNIOR. *Poenulus* A. 5. S. 2.

terrogative mode, by which a question is asked; the same as the indicative in termination, agreement, &c. but different in position; it stands before its subject, as *Lovest thou?* 6. The optative mode expressing a wish “*May you live happily*”: or “*God grant success*”. 7. The potential expressing power* “*I can repeat the whole*”. 8. The obligative, expressing duty “*I should work*” or “*I ought to work*”. 9. The permissive, giving leave, “*You may go*”. And from other auxiliaries, and other positions, still more modes might, upon this plan, be invented. But the last *four* not differing in their principal verb, and taking their distinction and name from the meaning of their auxiliary, may be well referred to the explanation of auxiliaries. Those modes which are expressed just alike though they convey different meaning are logically, not grammatically, distinct. Thus the second, third, and fourth will be taken out of the way. The first is a form of the verb employed in almost every other mode†. Lastly, the interrogative mode, though very distinct in sense and position, is so consonant in other respects to the indicative, that they may well be reckoned the same; its formation and construction being specified in a rule for the purpose. See art. 300, 309.

The five allowed modes have been sufficiently explained, and their accidents and construction pointed out in art. 292—296. The indicative mode, in its assertive form, is the only one that is susceptible of truth or falsehood. Mr. Harris, who seems to be the author of this observation, supposes the potential to be in some degree susceptible of these qualities; but his instances of potentials “*This may be*” and “*This might have been*” (book i. chap. 8) are real indicatives. In a certain sense, indeed, by supplying an ellipsis, the imperative asserts: “*Go home*” is “*I command or entreat you to go home*”: it cannot, however, be false, because the command or entreaty is indubitable.

The change in the order of the modes, which I have hazarded in vol. i. will perhaps shock the regular, scholastic grammarian; but will gratify the practical one by facilitating his labours, and hastening his progress. The simple participial mode is more easily apprehended than the multifarious indicative; and I believe the modes will be found to increase in difficulty, according to their present order, from the former to the latter. At the end of the first dissertation, we shewed the pro-

* *Neither the Latin nor English ever had properly the optative and potential modes.* † *Dr. Wallis calls it the infinitive mode, but surely it cannot be that with plural subjects in the indicative as, We walk.*

bability of the indicative, or at least its various inflexions, being of later invention than other states of the verb; now certainly ease in teaching and order of invention are very good rules by which to dispose the subjects we consider. Mr. Harris insinuates that the utility and dignity of the indicative give it a title to the first place; if so, the golden rule, or practice, should be first in arithmetic; and Euclid's elements should have begun with the forty-seventh proposition.

A brief and probable theory of the origination of the modes of the verb in the present form is this. The original state of the verb is its substantive, or the representative of its leading idea. The INFINITIVE adds *to*, that is *do* or *act*, to distinguish it from its kindred name; for example, *act whistle* or *act whip* from *thing whistle* and *thing whip*. The terminations *ing* and *ed* are other words, or fragments of them coalescing with the verb and conveying their appropriate meaning in the PARTICIPLE. Such phrases as "I command you to walk" and "I entreat you to walk" by an ellipsis of the first four words became the imperative. An ellipsis of certain auxiliary verbs, as *may*, *shall*, *can*, and others, produced the present subjunctive. And the various forms of the indicative are derived from the junction of certain small words of the nature of adverbs and pronouns that denoted time, person, and number.

Mr. Harris has amused us with adding titles to the names of his modes; but those who have leisure to catch at these slender threads of speculation will purchase his book.

DISSERTATION XIX.

ON TIMES.

Tempus, fluxu more, instabili volentur cursu.

Præfixum.

Time or duration is a subject in the contemplation of which metaphysicians of the profoundest research and most penetrative faculties have been lost and confounded. Leaving, however, to that class of scholars, what is most abstruse, and most inane, in these speculations, it may suffice for us to begin with acknowledging the common division of time, present, past, and future; that is NOW, BEFORE NOW, and AFTER NOW. Time present is one indivisible instant: time past is an infinite number of instants, all agreeing in the circumstance of being past or gone by, but differing in distance from the present; and the like holds true of time future. The two latter then must either be considered as uniform or infinitely various. The first consideration

affords no varieties, the latter too many to be traced or noticed. But the numerous differing times in language are not owing to this different distance, but to a combination of the idea of other circumstances with the notion of present, past, or future; the circumstances of the action being unfinished, finished, or extended through a length of time. Beside these there are the words that signify the three times simple, not combining any of these other considerations. These are a kind of aorists, or indeterminate times, and may be classed as a fourth species of division, the want of attending circumstances forming as distinct a kind of tense as *difference* of circumstances.

Each of the three times then being subject to these four circumstances, there must be just three times four, or twelve, sorts of times, in the indicative mode, which in English happen to be pretty distinctly and methodically expressed. 1. The present indefinite, I walk, with its various persons thou walkest, &c. for these I mean not to enumerate, nor in the other times to mention, as they follow the first person of course, and are regularly varied by art. 296, 301. This time indicates simply the present, or with other words annexed extends to any portion of time in which the present is included; as, "He acts as constable this year": "I always love goodness". Hence it expresses universal truths, r. 311, case 1st.—2. The past indefinite, I walked; This act took place at some time; it might cease at that time; it might continue: it might continue long: these circumstances are all undetermined. 3. The future indefinite, I shall walk. Here beside the indeterminateness, there is a remarkable breach of analogy, in expressing what we call one time by two words. However futurity attended with circumstances is expressed by the same auxiliary—I shall have walked—and it changes *shall* for *will* in the same manner—I will have done—a regularity which atones for the above anomaly. 4. The present imperfect, I am walking; this ties our thought strictly to the present time, while it is evident the action has not closed. 5. The past imperfect, I was walking—plainly, On a certain time past I was engaged in that act and had not ceased. 6. The future imperfect, I shall be walking—the same, substituting time coming for time gone. 7. The present perfect, I have walked. At this instant it is true that at some time back I walked, and that I have now ceased. 8. The past perfect, I had walked—the same was true at an instant past. 9. The future perfect, I shall have walked—It will be true in some approaching instant. 10. The present continued, I have been walking. Here the time is present to which the action is referred. It is a fact now. The action was in performing at a time past, and may be either

complete or incomplete now. All that is asserted is its continuation. The same may be observed with a due change of the time in which the fact exists of 11. The past continued, I had been walking, and 12. The future continued, I shall have been walking.

The continued times have been neglected by grammarians, or partially enumerated and treated as nondescripts. The other nine, invented by our countryman Grocin, and by him supposed the whole of the verb, have been missed by some through ignorance and inattention; nay the justness of the distribution has been denied by no less authority than that of Dr. Priestley. See his eighth Lecture on the Theory of Language. Yet its own clearness, especially when the continued times are supplied, fixes it beyond the fear of subversion, or the need of vindication.

The misfortune has been, that respecting time as well as other grammatical topics, the mind has been slavishly swayed by the technicals of the Latin grammar. That language, poor in itself with regard to tenses, and more miserably impoverished by the mistakes of modern teachers, has been reckoned by many to express only five various times. And to this pitiful standard have writers narrowed the English, even while themselves were employing more than double the number in their own books; and when even in their translations of one Latin tense they have given us three English phrases plainly expressive of different meanings; *Amo*, I love, do love, or am loving.

All our grammarians have gone beyond the two tenses differenced by termination, the indefinite present and past. Even Dr. Priestley the successful champion of simplicity, who seemed, at first, resolved not to acknowledge any beside these two, very soon after enumerates, under the title of double and triple compounds, more than are to be found in any other grammar, this only excepted. Rudiments, part i. sect. 4. When therefore they have agreed in admitting compound tenses, why should they refuse a regular plan, which uniformly coincides with the practice of speech; especially one so beautiful and complete as that of the three times multiplied by the four circumstances?

The shades of meaning, indeed, between these nicely divided intervals, are not always kept perfectly distinct. Thus we might perhaps find instances of the indefinite times being used for the imperfect. In this case, however, there is a studied solemnity bordering on the obsolete. It may indeed be said that the indefinite, being not restricted to any of the three circumstances, may be used in all.

On the whole, one cannot follow these arrangements to

their utmost extent; and perhaps a fine taste, a good memory, and acute observation of language, as it exists in the best writers, will ever outsoar the rules whence they first borrowed assistance.

Before we close, it may not be amiss to say a little on time as it affects the other modes. The participles are rather distinguished by agency and passivity than time, but the participles of *have* and *be* denote time as well as their indicatives. The infinitive is subject to the several times of art. 304. The subjunctive has likewise all the times; but the present and future are alike. "If he walk; if he be walking; if he have walked; if he have been walking [now or hereafter]". The imperative mode is necessarily confined to the future, as it would be madness to command what is *done* or *doing*.

DISSERTATION XX.

ON AUXILIARIES, AND COMPOUND FORMS OF THE VERB.

To consider every grammatical accident as resulting from some abbreviation, authorised by the same kind of compact or consent, that ascertains the meaning of single words, is the proper basis of the science of speech. The major part of languages have terminations to denote the accidents, or to point out the abbreviations; and they serve for the secondary purpose of ornament. The English has but few of these*. It seldom employs them for the purpose of embellishment, and frequently supplies their place by some other contrivance. Not seldom we trust to the order, or even the tenor and connexion of the sentence to point out circumstances and relations unnamed. At

* *The number of our regular grammatical terminations will not exceed twelve in all. A neat explication of these, of the auxiliary verbs, of the conjunctions and prepositions, would form a grammar sufficient for many purposes, and better than some that are long, tedious, and laboured. But what will surprize some persons still more—and what, for any thing I know, is an original thought—the Latin grammar might be taught in the same simple method. A dictionary of terminations, amply and properly illustrated, would be the best acquisition to the learners of that language, and would save years of ill-spent time and toilsome labour. Perhaps to facilitate the acquisition of the classics, in some such way, would be a greater benefit to society than decrying them, for I know not whether they can well be spared, till the introduction of a universal, philosophical language.*

other times the terminations of substantives or pronouns are supplied by prepositions; whence the paucity of English cases. Last of all, many circumstances attending the verb are expressed, not by a multiplex variation, as in the learned languages, but by small words containing the assertion, and slightly but sufficiently indicating the circumstance; while the word which denotes the chief action, energy, motion, or state stands separately, in a form that has no assertive force. The small words are termed auxiliary verbs*.

All the circumstances of time, mode, person, and number cause the auxiliaries to be varied, while the principal verb with the same auxiliary remains unchanged. Most auxiliaries in all languages are varied irregularly, in what manner those used in English are inflected art. 301 sufficiently though very concisely explains. The reason of this irregularity is pointed out by Dr. Lowth "In words of very common use the caprice of custom is apt to get the better of analogy": and in more emphatical terms by a gentleman whose boldness, energy, and originality are as conspicuous in the philological as the political world, "Abbreviation and corruption are always bullests with the words that are most frequently in use". *Div. of Purley*. Dr. Priestley accounts for the total difference of some states, of the same word, from different synonymous terms having been used in different parts of a country; whence, on a more perfect communication, one word had one of its states authoris'd; and another, another.

Our auxiliaries are in number no less than nine. BE, which signifies in its proper sense *exist* may be analyzed, in its auxiliary use, into—I exist in the state—Hence the word which is governed by it is a participle void of assertive force, but containing the circumstance either of agency, exerting an energy or power of action—or of passivity, receiving, enjoying, or suffering the effect of some energy exerted. Its variations *am, is, was, be*, are so diverse they cannot be accounted for but by recurring to some, perhaps now obliterated but distinct, Saxon originals. HAVE is not easily traced from its first signification, *possess*, to that which it has in compound tenses; namely—be at or past the conclusion of an act or state. The best way to explain this verb

* Those that style them adverbs, or even signs of verbs, do not attend to the circumstances of their containing the force of assertion; of their inflexion for time, person, and number; and of their being now or formerly principal verbs in one sense. This method was just known in the learned languages; is more practiced in the modern; but most in the English.

is to consider it in connexion with its principal. It is susceptible of the addition of other auxiliaries both before and after it. Its inflexions are accounted for by an obvious syncope. *Haveſt* becomes *ba'eſt*, *ba'ſt*; *haveth*, *bav'th*, *bav's*, *ba'th*, *ba's*; and *haved*, *bav'd*, *ba'd*. *do*, *aet* or *perform*. It muſt be remarked that the Saxons had terminations to the verb in many caſes where they are now laid aſide; among the reſt they had *n* or *en* for the infinitive, as in Chaucer, "He was worthy *ban* his life". Hence, probably when the terminations were dropped, *to* was added in the infinitive, and *do* in the other modes*, to the original ſtate; becauſe *his*, in ſo many inſtances, is the ſame with the ſubſtantive. We ſee it therefore always followed by the original ſtate, not by a word with any of the terminations. Being from cuſtom confined to ſhewing emphasis, the compound tenſes formed with this auxiliary might be termed the preſent and paſt emphatic: the future emphatic is wanting, though we ſay *I ſhall do* where the auxiliary ſerves for reference. Its irregular forms may be derived thus, *doeſt*, *do'ſt*; *doeth*, *do'th*, *does*; *do'ed*, *do'd†*, *did*. *LET* is uſed as a principal verb in two directly oppoſite ſenſes; *to permit*, as We muſt not *let* go manifeſt truth; and *to binder* or *prevent*, as

Leave, ah, leave off, whatever wight thou be,

To *let* a weary wretch from her due reſt. *Spenser†*.

Its auxiliary ſignification is plainly derived from the former. As an auxiliary it is never varied, and always denotes the imperative. See notes on art. 305.

May and *can* are ever auxiliaries. They expreſs the two ſenſes of the Latin potential, and of *poſſe*. *May* appears properly to ſignify, There is no external or accidental hindrance—it is allowed; *can*, There is no natural or perſonal impediment—There is a poſſibility. The irregularities of theſe two verbs are remarkable though few. Their third perſon ſingular wants the characteristic ending; being *he may* and *can*, not *he mays* and *cans*. The way in which *might* and *could* are derived is, at leaſt to me, unknown. Theſe are defective or imperfect verbs, becauſe they want ſeveral cuſtomary ſtates, as the infinitive mode, both participles, and all compound tenſes. *SHALL* has now no ſenſe as a principal verb. Formerly it ſignified *ought*. It is now

* To Mr. Horne Tooke's reaſons for reckoning *to* and *do* alike both in derivation and meaning (chap. ix.) it may be added that we never uſe both before any principal verb: as *to do walk*, *to do ſit*, &c. † In the northern part of Lancaſhire they now pronounce this *dud*. ‡ In this ſenſe its participle perfect ſeems to be regular, as *Their ſenſes are letted from enjoying their objects*. Sidney.

a sign of futurity, in the first person simply; in the others indicating compulsion. In some cases with the first person it denotes willingness or consent mixt with anger or reluctance; and with the other persons mere event, but in a raised, solemn, or poetic style. This and the next auxiliary are subject to the same defect of parts as the two preceding ones. But the derivation of their anomalies is easier—*shall, shalld, shall'd, shal'd; should*; and for the other see note on r. 301. WILL signifies, as a principal verb, desire or wish. The distinction between *shall* and the auxiliary *will* is extremely delicate. Foreigners and even our brethren of North Britain and the sister island are frequently embarrassed by it. They cannot be far wrong, if they never express any thing disagreeable to themselves, if themselves be the subject, by *will*; if others be, by *shall*. See art. 301, 303 and notes. MUST signifies compulsion but not on the part of the speaker. This auxiliary is never varied, nor is it ever used but to denote a kind of future time indicative.

One may consider these auxiliaries as a species of defective principal verbs, and the principal verbs as infinitive modes.

The Latin term for a method of varying verbs is conjugation, for substantives declension. I have used neither of these technical words, as our variations, in both kinds, are not only simple, but generally uniform.

DISSERTATION XXI.

ON WORDS COMMONLY CALLED PARTICLES.

It is in the right use of these [namely the Particles] that more particularly consists the clearness and beauty of a good style. *Locke.*

It is generally supposed that the distinguishing property of what are called particles is to be uninflected. But whoever has read with attention the conversations at Purley will see the fallacy and the origin of this notion. For we have before proved that all speech was originally composed of substantives and verbs, and that all supposed particles originate from, and are some states of, one of these kinds of words. However, it must be granted that only one state or case remains in use. There is another error far more strange and far more fatal. The learned (for nobody else would have thought of such an absurdity) have considered particles, especially prepositions and conjunctions, as possessing no meaning, as conveying no idea. From this mistake have arisen farther inconveniencies: the use of these

important words has been more vague and various than it would otherwise have been : the knowledge of them has been represented as so abstruse and mysterious that few have had the courage to attempt it : and because the learned perceived their difference of meaning, while they were denying them to have any, certain technical, dubious terms have been invented to indicate it, instead of plain and simple explications.

But we have proceeded and will proceed, to the best of our power, in a different course. We will endeavour to shew the derivation, meaning, and use of the particles in general, beginning with the prepositions.—THROUGH signifies *way, passage, means*, literally in such examples as,

Through the gate of ivory he dismiss'd

His valiant offspring.

Dryden, Aeneid.

but figuratively in such as

The strong *through* pleasure soonest falls the weak *through* smart. It appears to be the Gothic substantive *dauro*, *door, gate, passage*, put in apposition. It will sound something more harsh, but not improper, if we insert the substantive itself, in its plainest meaning, instead of the preposition ; as, *Door the gate of ivory, &c.* ; and, The strong, *door* pleasure, soonest falls—Lexicographers have told us of various senses in which this preposition is used, but they may all be reduced to the above either literal or figurative*.

To, Gothic *Tau*, *Tauhts*, means *act, effect, result, tendency*†; WHILE, Anglo-Saxon *hwile time* ; TILL, A. *to-hwile end-time* ; FROM A. and G. *frum beginning, author* ; FOR G. *fairina, cause* ; OF, OFF G. and A. *Afora, consequence, follower* ; SINCE A. *sithens, seen (that and) thence* ; WITH G. *withan, join* ; WITH A. *wirthan, be*‡ ; WITHOUT A. *wirthan-utan, be-out* ; BY A. *beon, be*‡ ; BEFORE, BEHIND, BELOW, BESIDE, BENEATH, BETWEEN, BETWIXT A. *beon fore, &c. being at the fore or front, &c.*—UNDER A. *on-neder, on the lower [part]* ; BEYOND A.

* The constant congruity of this system is a prevailing proof of its truth, and in passing will justify our assumption : we have neither opportunity nor right to transcribe the full, satisfactory, learned, and humorous demonstrations of Mr. Horne Tooke, which the curious may see in the *Diversions of Purley*. † The prepositions from this part are given in capitals, their simple derivations in small Roman, and meanings in Italic ; subjoining a few notes and exemplifications when required, and referring for the full proof to the before-mentioned author. ‡ Upon the authority of Mr. Tooke, but I know not that either is used in this sense unconnected with the idea of instrument or agent.

bigeond, *be-past*; TOWARD G. tauí and weardian, *look-end*; ATHWART A. on and thweorian, *wrested*; AMONG A. on and gemengan, *mixed*; AGAINST (uncertain) *opposing**; AMID OR AMIDST, ALONG, AROUND, ABOARD, ACROSS, ASTRIDE ON midst, on long, &c.; ABOUT A. onboda, onbuta, *occupying the boundary*; AFTER G. aftaro, A. aefter, *more back or later*†; DOWN OR ADOWN (uncertain) *descending*‡; UP A [to] ufa||, *ascending*; OVER A. ufera, ofer; ABOVE A. on-be-ufan, *higher than*; EXCEPT Lat. ex-capere, excipere, exceptum, *take out*; IN A. and G. inna, *belly, interior*§; ON, AT (uncertain) *occupying, touching, contiguous*¶.

IN-TO, UN-TO, UN-TIL, UP-ON, THROUGH-OUT, &c. being compounds of prepositions already treated of, require no particular explanation.

Adverbs, as before remarked**, have been generally derived either from an oblique case, or from composition of terms, or from ellipsis. The composition is evident in such as are formed from entire words, prefixing *a*, as *abed*, in or on bed. This prefix is at some times the sign of the participle in old Saxon, but its derivatives are now confined, through oblivion of their source, to an adverbial sense; So *adrift*, *aghaft*, *ago*, *asunder*. Others again are formed by adding *wise*, or its corruption *ways*, signifying manner, as *likewise*, *always*; and others by adding *ly* (German and Saxon *lich*, *lyk*; *lig*, *ligen*; modern English *like*) to adjectives almost at pleasure.

Let us now notice a few of the more irregular adverbs, with the same plan, and the same guide, that we went over the prepositions with. NEEDS Eng. *need is*; ANON E. *in one* [instant];

* *The goodness of God does even save him against (opposing) his will. South. When it signifies in provision for it is corrupted from to provide against (opposing) a future evil, and thence applied indifferently to every thing future. Our author considers the derivation sort of certainty. † The comparative of aft, a term signifying back or hind, still preserved in seafaring language. This word is an allowed adjective in the phrases after times, &c.*

‡ *As, to go down (descending) a precipice. Several collateral words in different languages are mentioned by Mr. Tooke but no direct etymon. || Ufa meaning high or head the idea to (tendency) is certainly understood here; therefore it is introduced between crotchets. § I imagine inna is sufficiently proved to be the etymon of in though our author himself seems to doubt it. ¶ As we say, We were both at (occupying) that house, at (touching) the same time. On is not so much determined to a point or instant as at. We say on such a day at noon. On such a bridge at the northeast corner. ** Dis. xv.*

ENOUGH, Dutch *genoegen*, *content*; RATHER G. *rathizo*, A. *rathur**, *more readily, sooner, in a swifter manner*; STARK A. *starc*, *strong, to a violent degree*; AYE, YEA, YES†, A. *agen*, *ayen*, *ay-es*, *have, have that, certainly*; NOT, NO, Dutch *node*, no, *averse, unwilling, by no means, in no manner*; NAY, n'aye, *have it not, not at all*‡; GRATIS Lat. *in a free manner, without any cost, for favour only*; INDEED E. *in deed, in fact, truly*; PERHAPS E. *per hap, by chance, it may be*; FORSOOTH A. *for soth, because of truth*; SELDOM Dutch *zelden*, *rarely, at unfrequent times*; ONCE, TWICE, THRICE, Eng. *ones, twies, &c. possessives of one &c. at one's [time] &c.*

The difference of conjunctions and prepositions has been treated on already. The same word may be of both kinds, their difference not being in the nature or real meaning of the words, but in their grammatical or sentential employment. They may for a similar reason be confounded with adverbs.

We proceed to give, on our former plan, a list of the principal conjunctions, not before noticed. IF A. *gif* imperative of *gisan*, *give, allow*; UNLESS, A. *onles-onlesan*||, *dismiss*; YET A. *get-getan*, *get, gain [that point]*; STILL, A. *stell-stellan*, *put [that so]*; ELSE A. *ales-alesan*, *dismiss*; THOUGH A. *thasig-thasigan*, *allow*; BUT A. *bot-botan*, *superadd*; BUT A. *be-utan*—*beon-utan*, *be-out, omit*; AND A. *an-ad*—*anan-ad*, *add*; LESS A. *lesed* part. of *lesan*, *dismiss*; THAT A. *the particular one pointed out*; As Ger. *es*; so G. *fa*, as THAT.

The interjections appear to have two sources; first in nature itself, whither we may refer such words as *oh*, signifying extreme sensation, sometimes pleasant, but more frequently painful; *heighbo* denoting weariness, impatience, &c. The latter source is artificial language, in those instances where passion occasions words to be used in an unconnected and rapturous way; as *peace! soft! strange! behold!*

DISSERTATION XXII.

ON SENTENCES.

Aristotle's definition is, in the main, a good one "A form of speech which hath a beginning and an end within itself, and is of such a length as to be easily comprehended at once". Dr. Blair.

The reader may here, if he think proper, review what was

* The comparative of *rathe* an adjective used so late as in Milton's *Lycidas* "The *rathe* [forward] *primrose*". † For the distinction between *yea* and *yes*, see art. 324. *Aye* is nearly obsolete; provincially it answers to *yes*, and *ye* to *yea*. ‡ Also for the difference between *nay* and *no* look as above. || Means *onles* imperative of *onlesan*, *so the rest*.

said on this subject in the second and tenth dissertations; and he will find that sentences occasion most of the abstruse and difficult things in grammar. Hence arise the verbal terminations and distinctions. Hence the preposition and conjunction derive their existence. The greatest part of faults in language are committed by inattention to syntax or the rules of constructing sentences.

The most simple sentence is formed by the junction of a single substantive or pronoun with a single verb; as John writes—It falls. But in general all sentences are considered as simple, which have but one assertive word or verb, and but one subject of the assertion. For instance, if the verb be followed by another substantive which is the object or recipient of the verb's energy or action; as John writes poetry: Thomas strikes William: if there be a comparison, relation, or connexion of one or more substantives with the subject or with the object, expressed by a preposition, as The word of God produces obedience to him.

The simplicity of sentences therefore is not destroyed by the connexion of adjectives, or words of quality, with any of the substantives; as, The *good* word of God produces obedience—for these must be considered either as other substantives put in apposition, and describing the same thing; or as contractions of other substantives and prepositions—as we can say in the last example of the last paragraph, The divine word, for The word of God. By the same rule adverbs may be contained in a simple sentence, as appears from their resolution, art. 251.

A compound sentence is a collection of words artificially arranged so as to contain the essence or meaning of several simple sentences, and yet so that, if it be divided anywhere, one of the parts at least is incomplete without some transposition, augmentation, or omission. Thus if I take this sentence from Goldsmith, "Their fortunes were nearly equal, and they were natives of the two most celebrated cities in the world; for Alcander was of Athens, Septimius came from Rome".—It is evident that here are four simple sentences—Their fortunes were nearly equal—They were natives of the two most celebrated cities in the world—Alcander was of Athens—Septimius came from Rome: yet it is likewise evident that if I stop at *equal*, I cannot begin with *and*, for it signifies add something to equal; if at *world*, I cannot begin with *for*, because that means the circumstance following is a cause or proof of that preceding; and the last clause is affected with *for* in the same manner, though it is not expressed.

When several subjects, objects, or verbs are all connected

with the same word, and thus may be resolved into so many simple sentences by supplying the common ellipsis, this makes another kind of compound sentence. "She trembled, blushed, and wept" may be resolved into—She trembled—She blushed—She wept. And in general, I believe, whatever compound sentence is divided by the common stops, it has so many inclusive simple sentences as it has points.

DISSERTATION XXIII.

ON GOVERNMENT OF WORDS.

Government or regimen is one word or phrase in a sentence, either in its own nature, or through being in some certain state, occasioning another word to be in another certain state. Thus the word *than* preceding the relative *who* always causes it to be in the objective case, *whom*; and hence *than* is said, in technical terms, to govern an objective of the relative *who*. Thus again the verb *am* in the infinitive mode requires the objective case of a pronoun; in other modes requires a nominative. We say, I take it *to be him*; and *It is he*. The infinitive mode of *am* then governs an objective of the pronoun; and other modes a nominative.

To give a general reason for this property of regimen, which yet shall be a sufficient one for every particular case is perhaps impossible. It is artificial; the consequence of abbreviations, and of compound sentences. In many cases we can only appeal to custom; yet, for that custom no doubt there must be an obsolete reason, which may perhaps sometime be discovered. Its most general use is to express a relation between the governing and governed word; the same end that is at other times accomplished by prepositions, or even by the order of the words.

This remark accounts for the difference of the number of rules of government in different languages. The Latin language abounds with these far more than our own. How tedious in that grammar are the rules for the government of cases by adjectives and verbs*! What difficulty does the different regimen

* Some adjectives take a case answering to the the preposition they require in English, as *Cupidus auri*, Covetous of gold; *Idoneus bello*, Fit for war. But others require one quite differing; as, *Dignus honore*, Worthy with honour. The verb, the rules of which are very

of the modes, gerunds, and supines occasion, as well as the cases of prepositions! Little of all this is to be discovered in the English; indeed, the greater part of it seems to have nothing to supply its place.—The French language has some peculiarities in this way, the principal of which is its conjunctive pronoun.

The most remarkable instances of regimen, and most similar to the Greek and Latin construction, are, The government of the objective case of the pronoun* by the verb and by the preposition†; of the infinitive mode of one principal verb by another preceding it‡; of the same mode without the preposition, to by a particular set of verbs||; of the participle present in its substantive or gerundial employment by prepositions whenever they come before a verb, as in *walking*, *from acting*; of a subjunctive mode by words that imply doubt or uncertainty§; of the objective of *utro* by *than*¶; and a few others requiring more explanation, to which we proceed.

Conjunctions do not govern any one kind of case certainly; but their government depends on circumstances, on obvious ellipses. There is therefore less of mystery, or arbitrary rule, in

numerous, does not always govern the case which its English construction would lead us to expect, *Parvi ducitur probitas*, *Honesty is esteemed of little*. *Obedio patri*, *I obey to my father*. *Cares virtute*, *You want in virtue*

* Art. 272. † It would be difficult to say why the pronoun should be subject to this rule and not the substantive—why we can say, *John esteems Peter*, and *Peter esteems John*; but cannot say, *He esteems I* and *I esteem be*. Yet such is the force of custom, that, till we have studied universal or transcendental grammar, the rule appears necessary and natural.—It is remarkable that on Mr. H. Tooke's plan most of the prepositions are derived from substantives, most of the conjunctions from verbs; now the prepositions being substantives and always put with other substantives (for pronouns are such on this plan) the construction must be absolute; but the English pronouns put absolutely are in the nominative case: hence it would appear that pronouns with prepositions should be in the nominative. Again the conjunctions are verbs; the pronoun following conjunctions should therefore be in the objective case; but any case comes after conjunctions. It is not from any distrust of the Purleian system that I make these remarks; the contrary appears throughout this work: my design is to stir up some intelligent advocate to clear away the difficulties. ‡ Art. 293. || Ibid. § Art. 295 and note. ¶ Art. 327. Lowth says because the relative here has no reference to any verb or preposition understood, but only to its antecedent.

this part of grammar than most others. It is only when the word following the conjunction is a pronoun, that any direction is requisite; and then only when it is a single word: if the conjunction stand between two full and fair sentences the construction will be intuitively apparent. Now in the instance of a single pronoun following a conjunction there is necessarily an ellipsis, and the supplying of that ellipsis discovers the case of the pronoun according to other rules. Thus in this sentence, "There is none greater in this house than *I*" if we insert the supplement *am*, we see the reason of the last word being in the nominative case—"none greater than *I* [*am*]" "It was well expressed by Plato, but more elegantly by Solomon than [*by*] him". The supplement *by* shews the reason of the following objective*.

Interjections have been said to have ~~no~~ government, but those of addressing take a nominative of the second person from their very nature, as, "O ye Corinthians!" It may, indeed, be as justly said to be pointed out by the general connection, as to be governed by the previous particle. Interjections of complaining take an objective of the first person. It has been conjectured that *me*, *thee*, &c. are sometimes used as datives, which is certain as to the Anglo-saxon. So that Ah me—is ah (or alas) for me. In such phrases, as Me miserable! unhappy me! some verb may be understood of which me is the object, *miserable* being an adjective belonging to it (*me miserum*) and where no such ellipsis can be justly supposed, it may be an imitation.

Different auxiliaries require a different state or mode of the principal verb; but the personal, numeral, or tensal change is in the auxiliary, the principal remaining the same. *Do*, *shall*, *will*, *may*, *can*, and *must* govern the original state. *Be* when a part of the compound of a verb in the active state governs the present or active participle; than which nothing can be more natural, as the verb is then as an adjective, so that it may be supposed a very evident ellipsis. I am [*a*] loving [person]. For the same reason, when a part of the compound of a verb in the passive state, it governs the participle passive or perfect, as does likewise the auxiliary *have*, but from an obscurer cause.

We have before hinted that the intricate business of government of cases is done away in English, prepositions being substituted for cases. Instead of it however we have government of prepositions; if the term can be allowed where not different states of words are required, but different words. This generally depends on the sense of the prepositions, which has before been given; as when we say, He soared *beyond* the clouds: He came

* Article 327.

after me : He walked *to* Manchester. The use of the prepositions in all such instances is too obvious to need rules*.

But there are cases in which custom, the forgotten etymology of the word†, or some other cause has produced the employment of a preposition apparently more remote. What reason for instance can be given why we should say that a person is *informed of* and *acquainted with* a thing? and why, since the phrases are equivalent, cannot we change the particles and *inform him with* it, or *acquaint him of* it? What difference does it make whether we *reveal* or *relate* it to him, or *tell* him? in which last phrase the same idea is expressed by a short familiar term, and without preposition. We *consider*, *conclude*, and *determine upon* a thing; we are *ashamed at* a thing, and *for* a person.

A very intimate knowledge of etymology will direct us in the former class. This is the prime benefit of learning languages; which, yet, may now be attained by the English scholar, guided properly and disposed for exertion. As to the latter class there appear only three ways of becoming master of them; an attention to the best models of language—an application to those dictionaries (Dr. Johnson's for instance) that point them out—and learning a table in which they should be enumerated‡.

Some particular states of words govern peculiar prepositions. The superlative degree of adjectives has *of*; adjectives that are always comparative *to*. The comparative degree has the conjunction *than*||; and this indeed very much resembles a preposition.

Of that set of conjunctions which have others correspondent to them, the preceding conjunctions may be said to govern their correspondent ones, in the circumstances and according to the manner prescribed in the rules. So in this sentence, *Though I am poor yet I am content*; the former conjunction governs the latter.

DISSERTATION XXIV.

ON THE AGREEMENT OF WORDS.

Concord, or the agreement of words, is one word through

* *The supposed various senses of prepositions are chiefly owing to vulgarity or mistake in the authors who use them. Dubious is the merit of these lexicographers and grammarians, who by laboriously enumerating these various senses, stamp them, to an inattentive or weak pupil, with equal authority.* † *We ought to say averse from a thing, because the derivation is a from and verito to turn. To has been commonly put through ignorance of the derivation.* ‡ *Sorry I am to say that I have seen no such table.* || *Art. 282.* § *Art. 326.*

being in a certain state, causing another to be in the same. Example,

Stern moves the bull along th' affrighted shores,

And countless nations tremble as he roars. *Seward.*

Here *bull* agrees in person and number with the verb *moves*, and in person, number, and gender with the pronoun *he*: *nations* agrees in person and number with *tremble*, and *be* with *roars*.

Our rules of concord are still more disproportioned to those of the antient languages than our rules of regimen. In adjectives it is totally set aside; only we have a few which are different when applied to different numbers, and a few which are confined to one number. We have even a few duals*. We have a kind of concord between the nominative case or subject and the verb. Yet a substantive and a verb are so very different in their nature and terminations, that one might almost venture to say the latter was *governed* by the former. But, allowing it to be concord, it differs much from that of the learned languages, having only three differences for number and person in the present time†, and two in the past. The other tenses being compound are varied by auxiliaries, which have only the same two times, and a similar paucity of terminations.

On this subject the following problems may be proposed. What are the reasons why our language has retained and omitted those particular accidents that we find it to have done? Whether has it retained the most useful? If not can the others be revived, and by what means? Would new accidents be of service? How could they be introduced?

Among the Latins the third concord was between the antecedent and the relative. These agreed in number, gender, and

* *Art. 286.* Perhaps our language though more simple is more artificial. Perhaps when the distinction of adjectives was unknown, there was no idea of a quality but as associated with an object; and it was thought absurd to denominate a good man by the same term as a good woman. So we now never call a man a widow, nor a woman an adulterer. The ease with which the Latin words corresponding to these *vidua*, *adulter*, become adjectives, and such words as *stultus* substantives, confirms the idea. The last word answers indifferently to the English fool or foolish. I believe the French say *saint John* with nearly the same ideas that we have when we say *holy John*. But whichever is more natural the simplicity of the English is much preferable. † The plural termination retained till the reign of Henry the eighth we have noticed before; but it appears that it did not vary for the persons. These circumstances accord perfectly with the characteristical simplicity of the English language.

person, but not in case. Our relatives have no number, or are alike in both; so that it is the verb following them only that is affected by the number of the antecedent. The same remark may apply to the persons. In gender they admit of a curious singularity. One pronoun, (*who*) refers to either sex, provided its antecedent be a rational being. Another, (*which*) refers to things irrational of all the genders. The third (*that*) may be used with reference to any gender, and to things with or without reason.

It is in long sentences that both concord and regimen are most difficult. In the shorter we are regulated by something like intuition, having the former governing or agreeing word immediately in view when pronouncing the latter. It is the business of the practical grammarian to fix upon long examples, and, after deranging, to restore them; adverting, in the course of the process, to the reasons of what he performs.

DISSERTATION XXV.

ON THE ORDER OF WORDS.

— Lucidus ordo — Horace.

The idea of rules of order was almost unknown to the languages of Greece and Rome. They had indeed customs of fixing one kind of words in one part of the sentence, and other kinds in other parts; but they scarce attained the force of rules. When any of them happen to be dignified with prescriptive authority, they are rather rules of place than of order. In most cases they are contrary to the order of the modern languages, especially of our own.

We differ from them very much, not merely in our customary order, but in our extreme strictness respecting it; not only the elegance and propriety of our sentences depending upon it, but their perspicuity, and not seldom their entire meaning*.

The common order of words in an English sentence was laid down in art. 333; but that account wants correcting, explaining and augmenting. We shall find no sentence in which every sort of words is found that is in the rule. Except the two necessary parts, the subject and indicative mode, any of the others may be dropped; and then those that stand on either side the omission must be reckoned contiguous. In this sentence which

* The French indeed are still stricter in this respect than we. 6

contains as many of the parts mentioned as most—O James, John writes letters, to improve, daily, if he have leisure—there is an omission from the addressing substantive to the subject of the verb; and a preposition is wanting afterwards. With respect to the parts omitted, Indefinite adverbs of order, time, and place belong to another kind of sentences which I shall call double indicative ones, because they have two indicatives not joined by a conjunction, and are answered by definite adverbs succeeding the former verb or its retinue; as, *When* thou shalt call *then* I will answer: *Where* malice finds a place, *there* every evil resides. The indefinite adverbs may be put in a single sentence but then no definite one will follow; as, O James, *sometimes* John writes letters, to improve, if he have time. A conjunction when employed to join one sentence to another preceding, is placed first in the sentence; as, Again John writes, &c. but this conjunction cannot follow the interjection or addressing substantive. When a relative is used it is placed previous to the governing word and its subject. For instance—*Which* John wrote with his crow-pen.—A preposition frequently precedes the relative, as it is made to do in the rule—*To whom* John writes many a letter. An interrogative, if employed, has the same place with the relative, and may have a preposition like it; as *What* and *to whom* doth John write? So too an indefinite, *Whatsoever* and *to whomsoever* John writes, he is improving. We must expect seldom to find above two of the parts previous to the necessary ones in the same sentence; as the interjection and address, or the preposition and some one of the three kinds mentioned next after it.

The preposition mentioned after the infinitive mode should be followed by a substantive or pronoun, which was mist through inattention, or some misfortune of copying. Example, John writes letters to improve *in penmanship*. But there is less need to notice this particularly, as these words may, by prepositions, be connected to any principal part of a sentence, and even to each other in trains; in which case the preposition follows the said principal part, and the connected word the preposition; as in this sentence, John *at my father's* writes letters *to his brother—at the warehouse—of Sykes and Cromford,* to improve *in composition,* if he have leisure *from his other occupations.*

In this analysis adjectives, adverbs, and auxiliaries are not noticed because they ever adhere to their corresponding words.

Participles, when they consist of the attributive only, stand as adjectives,—a *working* man—when they represent a person engaged in the act at a time pointed out by the discourse, the order is contrary; as, I saw a man *working*.

With the subject of the subjunctive mode the sentence does not always close : it may have another infinitive following ; as, John writes letters, to improve, daily, if he have time *to sit*. Of course anything else that will follow the infinitive mode may be added. Indeed the various lengths of sentences are indeterminable.

The necessity of exactness in our rules of order proceeds from our want of such inflexions, in all the principal words, as at once perplexed and adorned what are styled the learned languages. Hence we are obliged to put all words nearly related in a proximate position : thus we see the subject and verb, the verb and object, the adjective and substantive, the auxiliary and principal, as nearly as possible cohering ; and none of these regularly separated but by something closer in the sense. Even priority gives way to coherence of connected terms.

This priority itself does likewise imitate nature ; I mean the nature of the existences which are the subjects of discourse, not that of the passions or views of the speaker. Thus if a verb be considered as the energy, exertion, or effect of an agent, that agent, styled in technical language the subject of the verb, must rationally be considered as prior to the emanation or energy ; and the effect produced, or subject operated upon, either of which is considered as an object of the verb, must succeed the exertion, energy, or action. For if not, let us suppose them inverted ; the effect has been and there has been no exertion to produce it ; the exertion and no being to put it forth : we perceive such a supposition a manifest absurdity. This accounts for the position of the more essential parts. For the rest interjections, addressing substantives, and interrogatives begin a discourse for the exciting of attention, which would be too late when the sentiment had been delivered or proposed. The places of adjectives and adverbs are chosen principally to avoid separating parts more connected ; and sentences introduced by indefinites are prior to the others, because they denote the circumstances of time and place in which the events happened ; but these circumstances are plainly prior to the event itself ; they existing necessarily ; the event, as we conceive inclusively or dependently with respect to them.

The antient languages follow a different order ; when not regulated by euphony or invented elegance they follow the order of perceptions. They frequently begin with the effect or object ; mount to the verb ; and terminate, where the energy began, in the subject or agent*. For the effect or object strikes

* And this when they use the active verb ; for we do so with the

the perception soonest, and the affections, in many cases, most easily; so this mode of speech presents itself most readily, and besides is more pathetic.

Both the simple structure and natural order of our speech appear to be the work of design, in order to attain two objects, undoubtedly desirable, ease and certainty.

But we are not to suppose that our words flow ever undisturbed in the regular course we have described. The influence of the passions, the desire of variety, the taste of harmony, the artifice of numbers, and the exigencies of laboured construction, all tend to produce transpositions in vast abundance.

Transposition occasioned by the force of affection is very natural. It is the necessary result of one object, idea, or sentiment in a good degree engrossing the minds, which occasions it to be introduced as early as possible, whether according to grammatical rule or not. Sometimes, too, inversion is designedly employed, when an orator wishes to speak impressively, because it may tend to awaken attention. Instances,

He pluck'd, he tasted: *Me damp horror chill'd.* *Milton.*
 "Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth, may Israel now say". How languid would this be in the regular order—Israel may say now, They have afflicted me many a time from my youth.—"*To no purpose are they endowed with the best abilities, if they want activity for exerting them. Unavailing in this case will be every direction that can be given them.*"

Upon similar principles it is used in describing objects of vast import, of magnificence, and grandeur.

Him the Almighty power
Hurl'd headlong flaming from the ethereal sky, &c. *Milton.*

The desire of variety, so congenial to the mind, especially in a cultivated state, induces an author of taste to invert terms where he can do it without ambiguity, constraint, or affectation, and without a sameness of inversion, to avoid which he will often prefer the grammatical order.

There are many circumstances of phraseology in which this inversion of mere variety may be practised without inconvenience. The neuter verb may be placed before its subject—On thy right hand *stood the queen*—the subject being evident, because verbs of this kind admit no object. The objective of pronouns may be set before the verb—*Them* that sin rebuke before all—its case proving that it is an object. The subject, ob-

passive state which seems to have been invented for the purpose. † *Our country people often take a similar plan, but for want of a more perfect language they are led into solecisms and incomplete sentences.*

ject, and verb may be thrown into any position at pleasure when the two former are of different numbers—*Amusements youth* requires—for agreement in number instantly points out the proper subject, and of course disagreement the object. A substantive and connecting preposition may be inserted together, previous to, and distant from, the word which they should follow—Two months had now passed, and *of Pekuah* nothing had been heard.

Not only do the original rules of syntax in certain cases favour transposition, but by-rules may be laid down from established custom expressly for transposed passages. That substantive or pronoun which follows the auxiliary, when the object or any other member usually following precedes it, will be the subject, as *Him hath God raised up*. There will *men* worship and praise.

We do not transpose very freely for the sake of harmony; yet we are not without very pleasing instances, particularly in the translation of the poetical parts of scripture. “With the Lord there is mercy; and with him there is plenteous redemption”.—“They have mouths but they speak not: eyes have they, but they see not”.

Our poets however are very much unrestrained in this respect: we seem to allow them an almost unbounded licence in position to compensate for the want of it in every other department. They more frequently use their power in neglecting the general order than the contiguity of related words, seldom emulating the very varied position adopted by the classic poets of antiquity.

The most frequent of all the poetic inversions is that of the adjective after the substantive,

The *Stoic proud*, for pleasure, pleasure scorn'd. *Young*.

Now in swift flight they pass'd the *trench profound*. *Pope*.

I lose myself in *light ineffable*. *Thomson*.

Far into Chaos and the *world unborn*. *Milton*.

Genius warm and judgement chaste. *Warton*.

Yet I believe this should not be resorted to without some necessity of measure or rhyme. A more remarkable phrase is the Miltonian inversion, where one adjective precedes, and another follows the substantive, as

Who to the *fraudulent impostor foul*

In his uprightness answer thus return'd. P. L. iii, 692.

The poets sometimes put even an active verb before its subject, and without those preceding phrases that conceal the derangement; but this is generally attended with a degree of harshness.

O'er the green soil his kids exulting play,

And *sounds* his clarion loud the *bird* of day. *Severard*.

Resounds the living surface of the ground. Thomson.

But to limit the different transpositions, even of those peculiar to verse, would be a mighty task; besides the other sorts occur more frequently than in prose, as the style is more laboured, more pathetic, and more varied. Other instances.

No vassal God nor of his train *am I.* Pope.

Hence all the good *from opulence* that springs. Goldsmith.

Short and sickly *are they all.*

Those inversions that proceed from the exigencies of construction become rules in the specified circumstances. The words *such, many* (in some connections) *what*, as also adjectives after *so, too, as*, and *how* will have the article between them and the substantive. "For thy sake I have shed *many a* tear". Shaks. "What a piece of work is man!" *id.* *How despicable a creature* must that be who is in pain for what passes among *so frivolous a* people. Steele.

Frequently the adjective is after the substantive that its dependent word may follow it without separating it from the substantive; as, Feed me with *food convenient for* me. So when the adverb enough is connected with it; as, *Wine good enough*: because this adverb always following the word it affects would separate the substantive and adjective without the additional transposition.

When several adjectives characterize the same substantive they are best after it; as "The valley *wide and fruitful* supplied its inhabitants with the necessaries of life". Johnson.

In many instances the auxiliary *do* is introduced, merely or principally to favour the transposition.

There are inversions which can be referred to custom only. Of this kind perhaps is the constantly putting the definite article as well as possessives between the adjective *all* or *both* and the substantive, as *all the world; both my sons*:—placing *enough, enough, alone, and only* meaning *alone*, constantly after the substantive; placing the adjective last in such phrases as, *six feet high*; placing the subject after the auxiliary, when *never, nor*, and *neither* begin the sentence; in which case *do* or *did* is put with simple assertion; as, *Never were people so happy. Neither did his brethren believe on him.*

In general whatever cause may seem to require an inversion, it should leave the sentence clear, correct, and evidently unaffected. A contrary practice perplexes and disgusts. A portion of common sense, a habit of turning over sentences in the mind, a ductility in yielding even a favorite order to the general current of the paragraph, and a taste refined by long acquaintance with the essays of Addison, Knox, and Blair, and the poems of

Pope, Goldsmith, and Hayley, will induce a propriety and grace in the order of construction perhaps not attainable by strict rules. These notwithstanding, are useful; and will be most prized, if exact, by those who need them least.

DISSERTATION XXVI.

OF THE COMPLETION OF SENTENCES.

A verb indicative or imperative seems as necessary to the formation of a sentence, as a vowel to that of a syllable*. The subject of a verb is necessary too, but may be a substantive, pronoun, infinitive, or participle. With an imperative it may even be understood or implied.

The same verb may be associated with several subjects, but then it belongs distinctly to each: unless in cases where the very nature of the verb rejects coalescence with the apparent subjects singly; then the phrase or all the things conjointly are the subject; as "the black line, the dotted line, and the red line, make up a triangle".

Every assertion must evidently be respecting something; every possessor must possess something; every preposition and adjective require an object or concomitant word by their definition; every substantive, pronoun, or verb must have some kind of connexion with other words in the sentence. On these evident principles depends the latter part of r. 331. It may be further remarked that every corresponding conjunction must, from its nature and definition, have another answering to it; and when several similar words are all equally connected with a different one, a conjunction is required among them.

When any one of these required correspondents are wanting it proceeds either from defect; or from redundancy, because the word that seems to require the other is useless; or from ellipsis, when the word, though not expressed, may be well enough supplied by the common sense of the hearer. This figure or licence is not only convenient, but in many instances highly beautiful, and merits a fuller consideration.

1. When any member of a sentence would be repeated in a subsequent part, and cannot but be properly supplied if omitted, the ellipsis becomes almost necessary. Under this general head are comprehended what some grammarians have laboriously amplified into many varieties. Instances abound; as, If I have

* *Art. 331, and Dis. xxii.*

spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if [I have spoken] well, why smitest thou me? God rewards the righteous; and [God] punishes the wicked. Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him thou art my Son, &c. [glorified him]. It was full of judgement; righteousness lodged in it; but now murderers [lodge in it]. The man and [the] woman are dead. What am I, and from whence [am I?]. O pity and [O] shame! This coach is the King's [coach]. He will often argue that if this part of our trade were well cultivated, we should gain from one nation; and if another [part of our trade were well cultivated, we should gain] from another [nation]. 2. The relatives are very often to be supplied; as, This is the man [whom] I sent. 3. Principal verbs are often understood after being once inserted, and only the auxiliaries used. He visits us but seldom, but when he *does* [visit us] it adds to every man else a new enjoyment of himself. The object of the verb is also understood. Care must be taken that wrong auxiliaries be not employed. 4. Prepositions are frequently omitted; as,

What made directors cheat [in] the South Sea year?

Such an omission might lead one to assign a wrong object. 5. The preposition *to* is almost constantly dropt after *send, give, lend, &c.* and when it is so, the word that is connected by *to* comes before the object of the verb: He gave not [to] God the glory. This, if completed, should be retransposed—He gave not the glory to God. 6. *If* or *though* are elegantly left out and the subject and verb following transposed; as,

Thought fond man

Of these and all the thousand nameless ills, &c.

for *If fond man thought*—7. Conjunctions are frequently understood when rapidity of speech is required; in this ellipsis the construction must be according to the conjunction understood.

The city, army, [and] court *espouse* my cause.—

A praise, a smile, [or] a look from her *is* worth

The shouts of thousand amphitheatres.

8. A member of a sentence is seldom repeated after *than* or *as*. He can dance better than I [can dance]. He loves you as well as [he loves] me. 9. Not unfrequently, to avoid repetition, the ellipsis takes place in the former part of the sentence; as, I am [satisfied] and shall be satisfied. 10. Any tense of the verb *to be* is easily understood; which accounts for what we have termed the phrase absolute, art. 313:

His best companions [were] innocence and health.

11. The conjunction *that* is often left out; as, I told him [that] you would come. This should be confined to a light familiar

style. 12. Names of objects are suppressed when the speaker points or is supposed to point at them; as Who is that [man?]

13. All the words in a question after the interrogative are understood in the answer*; as Who created man? God [created man].

14. Many phrases which appear very improper or odd on a cursory view, and the greatest part of those denominated Anglicisms, may be accounted for by ellipsis. For example, To let blood [out]. To let a thing [slide] down. Wo is (to) me. Well is (to) him. Let us walk (through the space of) a mile.

15. The words *man*, *men*, *person*, *persons*, &c. are understood after adjectives. God despieth not any (man). The definite article is often prefixed to the adjective thus used; as The meek (persons) shall inherit the earth†.

16. The leading correspondent conjunctions *either* and *neither* are frequently understood; as (Either) he or they must yield. (Neither) rival nor friend has he.

17. Words that can be supplied may in general be omitted when the laws of versification or the neatness, harmony, or grandeur of a period may require it. The words *should we*, *ought we*, or *do we*, are neatly dropt after, *why*—Why (should we) pay men extravagantly who have but little to do? *Paine*. The words *one* and *another* after *from* and *to*; as Pettý curiosity led him on from (one) trifle to (another) trifle. *Johnson*. The personal pronoun before the relative; as,

Who here

Will envy (him) whom the highest place exposes

Foremost to stand against the Thunderer's aim.

The preposition *on* and adverb *when* are both omitted, and *that* turned into *what*, as

What day the genial angel to our fire

Brought her, &c.—

instead of *On that day when* the genial, &c.—So “What time” a common phrase with the poets. Something similar is this ellipsis of the word *place*—The son of man hath not (a place) *where* to lay his head. The auxiliary —*do*

Trace not the fair domestic plan

From what you would (do) but (from) what you can (do).

A great variety of frequently recurring substantives are omitted, and the omission scarce perceived; as We called at (the sign of)

* *Harris, Hermes*, b. i. c. 8. *The adverbs of affirmation and negation, as the same writer observes, are so contrived as to save a repetition of nearly all the words of the question. Are these verses Homer's? These verses are Homer's—expressed by YES only; the contrary by NO. † Art. 287.*

the Anchor. It is (a) good (thing) to praise God. So the words *act, task, matter, &c**.

Not only many phrases may be accounted for by this figure, but even several rules of syntax. The uses, of it, as Mr. Buchanan has observed, are *elegance, brevity, and dispatch*. To these may be added an occasional assistance to *harmony*. Its abuse appears when it introduces obscurity, forms ambiguous phrases, or causes disgust by the semblance of affectation.

DISSERTATION XXVII.

ON ANOMALIES.

Language being the work of man is neither regular nor perfect.—Originally the work of uncultivated men, it was formed upon no scientific plan, upon no system of principles, but according to the necessity or caprice of the instant. It is in its own nature incapable of sudden change. Theorists may propose, and writers of eminence may introduce gradual reformations; but the humble province of the practical grammarian is to register the tongue in its present state, with all its blemishes and obliquities.

One source of our anomalous words is our borrowing from other languages, especially the Saxon, French, and those we call learned, and retaining the inflexions which are regular in the original. From this source in particular, arise many of our irregular plural† and defective comparisons‡.

The greatest part of the irregular verbs are deduced from the Saxon. They are pure native English words, and all, as Dr. Lowth observes||, either monosyllables or compounded. The regular as well as irregular inflexion of verbs is derived from that source. For example, from *afedan*, *afed*, come *feed*, *fed*; from *bringan*, *brohte*, come *bring*, *brought*; from *cnaðwan*, *cnaðwen*, *know*, *known* originally *knowen*.

The author just mentioned, had the idea of nearly excluding

* Some authors reckon as ellipses what appear to me to be complete sentences: Such as, *Man (they put he) is the Lord of the creation. Beware of idleness, which (they put idleness) is an enemy to virtue.*

† Vol. i. r. 263. ‡ Rule 285.

|| INTROD. On irregular verbs. *Perhaps this remark might, in its full sense, be extended to all words in all languages. But we have now a custom of calling those words simple, whose roots we cannot discover.*

the term irregular from verbs, by dividing them into three conjugations, according to the three noted terminations of the participle given us in the Latin accidence; *d*, *t*, and *n*. But the paucity of the two latter classes, they not much exceeding a hundred words, and the variety of forms of the last, determined him to reckon only one class of regulars, and the two last as anomalies.

These verbs were denominated irregulars in vol. i. but reduced to twelve classes*, and by that means, and the contiguity of such as undergo similar changes contracted to less than two pages, whereas it is no uncommon thing for them to be extended to seven or eight.

The employment, and many of the anomalies of the auxiliary, appear to have the same original. No doubt many of them ranked as principal verbs, and became auxiliaries through the want of terminations for the times and modes; after this other verbs superseded them in their first sense, and they were confined to their servile use.

The third origin of irregularities is the adopting the inflected state of one synonymous word, and dropping the primitive; at the same time retaining the primitive state of the other words, and dropping the inflections. This is evidently the case with some of the irregular comparisons. Suppose we take for example the word *many*. This would have its degrees *manier*, *maniest*, but there was another word in use, synonymous or nearly so, *mo*. The degrees of this, *moer* and *moest*, were, either on account of their *superior* brevity, or euphony, or the capricious favour of some great authority, substituted for the regular degrees of *many*, while the positive itself sunk into oblivion. The spelling was afterwards altered so as to conceal the etymology. The great similarity of the comparative and superlative of all these irregulars, and their generally ending in *r* and *st*, or containing them, is a great proof of the propriety of these remarks.

Part of the irregular verbs, particularly those in r. 297, class 8. were evidently introduced in this way. To instance in one, the past time *went* is now always used for *did go*, but is itself the past time of an old word *wend*, just as *sent* is from *send*. We find the word in many old English pieces, as in the old ballad of Robin Hood, and Guy of Gisborne.

One shoote now will I shoote, quoth John,

With Christ his might and mayne;

He make yon sheriffe that *wends* so fast,

To stop he shall be-fayne.

* Art. 297.

Sometimes they are the effect of innovation, either by mere accident, or necessity, or for decoration, or for harmony. Of this kind, are the possessives in *s*, the figurative genders, the confounding of *you* and *ye*, the application of *who* to rationals and *which* to irrationals, part of the irregular and defective comparison, and of the adjectives adapted to particular numbers, and part of the irregular verbs, particularly those formed by leaving out *ed* after *d* or *t*, as *shed*, *slit*, &c. and those where *en* is dropt in the participle, as *slung* for *slungen*. The change of the numbers in the second person is likewise to be referred to this head; and perhaps the various forms adapted to the solemn style, which are so appropriated either from their antiquity, or their being used in the scriptures. But, in modern writers, they lose by the appearance of affectation more than they gain in solemnity.

Such dual and plural adjectives as *two*, *both*, *many*, &c. are peculiar in number necessarily, and are to be reckoned as irregularities on account of meaning. Of this kind are the rules respecting the substantive of multitude, and respecting the substitution of the present time for any other*.

Much akin to this subject is that of the similarity, apparent identity, and unauthorised change of words of different sorts, or of the parts of speech. Notwithstanding the general position that we have established in universal grammar, that substantives and verbs are the only sorts of words, yet the nine parts of speech taken in a practical view, are as well known, and as strictly limited as any thing in the science. In some cases, however, there is a considerable likeness between two of them, as

* *Almost every language has irregularities peculiar to it. The Frenchman when asked, How do you do? replies, How do I do what? Yet does not express the idea with more precision by his—Comment vous portez vous? The Italian substitutes for the second person the complimentary phrase your signiory, and afterwards a pronoun answering to she, even though speaking to a gentleman. This Baretti teaches with great humour in his Easy Phraseology, or Italian and English Dialogues, nearly as follows:*

MASTER. *When I am in Italy, I shall not speak a word to you. I shall then speak to a third person.* HETTY. *What person?* MASTER. *Your signiory.* HETTY. *Do you mean my maid?* MASTER. *No—Suppose I ask you, How you do, I shall say, How does she?* HETTY. *Is it possible?* MASTER. *The same question I shall ask to your Papa.* HETTY. *You make game of your scholar.*

In English, we substitute the third person occasionally, both for the first and second, by way of compliment and of modesty, but not by any rule.

in *brass*, *glass*, *grass*, the substantives, and *brazed*, *glazed*, *grazed*, the corresponding verbs. Sometimes they appear alike to the eye, but differ in pronunciation, as *a house* and *to house* (*houz*), *a rebel*, and *to rebel*. But sometimes they are alike in every thing but their connexion in the sentence, and yet are to be distinguished as different parts; as *Love*, the passion, and *to love*.

Now, to write correctly, it is required that one be familiar with all these properties of language; and we shall find words of almost any two kinds, possessing this apparent identity.

But as this different classification of apparently identical words puzzles the young grammarian in analyzing speech, so the proper use of those words that are totally alike is difficult to the unskilful composer. For though some words will thus be of different sorts, there are other words that have analogous ones which yet differ, either totally or by considerable alterations or additions. When I *walk*, my *action* is termed a *walk*; but when I *swear*, my *action* is denominated by a totally different term, *oath*, which has scarce a letter in common with the corresponding verb; when things differ, the state expressed by that verb cannot be called a *differ*, but must be expressed with a considerable addition, a *difference*; and when things alter, it cannot be called an *alter*, but an *alteration*. Here originates that wrong construction called a change of parts.

Pass we now to what are styled Grammatical Figures. The substance of what can be pertinently said on this topic, has been already given. The following will be considered by some, as a mere display of pedantic reading. It may, notwithstanding, help the reader's ideas a little, and will at least assist him to recollect the meaning of the several terms, if met with in literary conversations or philological works.

Figures are forms of speech more artificial or ornamented, than the natural and regular phraseology of a language.

Grammarians say there are four general figurative constructions that respect their art. ELLIPSIS or defect, fully treated on before; PLEONASM or Redundance, which in general is rather a fault than a figure; ENALLAGE or transformation, that is change of parts, to which the same remark will apply, unless where a word is of several parts, in which case, as the best dictionaries mark them, it is no Enallage. HYPERBATON or Transposition, which has likewise been considered before.

ELLIPSIS, they subdivide into *proper ellipsis*, already sufficiently treated of; *apposition*, where two substantives are used in the same construction, referring to the same thing, as King George—that is (say they) (The) King (who is called) George: *Asyndeton*, omitting conjunctions: *Syllepsis*, when the pronoun,

verb, &c. agrees with the worthier, as in r. 328; *Zeugma*, when it agrees with the nearer, as in r. 329; and *Prolepsis*, when the parts are mentioned after the whole, though differing from it in number and person, without repeating the verb or pronoun. We both are tired; I (*that is*, am tired) with speaking, you (are tired) with hearing*.

PLEONASM is subdivided into *Pleonasm proper*, which may be allowable in some cases of excited passion, as, I saw it with my own eyes; but is in general the blunder of redundancy or tautology; *Poly syndeton* or a superfluity of conjunctions; and *Periphrasis* or a variety of words expressing one thing, as in Thomson†,

See the light tenants of the barren air!
Instead of "See the birds".

ENALLAGE *proper*, changes the lesser accidents, as in the instance of the second person plural for singular, and present time for past or future; the second species, *Antimeria* is the change of parts of speech; *Synthesis* is when a word agrees not in construction but sense, as in the substantive of multitude; *Anacoluthon* is when clauses are inconsistent, which can never be a beauty but always a great blemish. An instance may be given by a close imitation of what the Latin grammarians exemplify this figure by, from Terence‡, "All we to whom some misfortune happens from any "quarter; all the time which passes in the interim before that "evil is known is for gain". The speaker begins as if he would have said—*Should reckon it as gain*—but ends as if he had begun—*To all us*.

HYPERBATON is made to include *Distance* of the agreeing words, as between "Of man's first disobedience", and "Sing heavenly Muse", in the beginning of *Paradise Lost*; *Anastrophe* or transposition; *Hyperon proteron*||, the first thing in sense being last in words; as, Shut the door and come in; this figure is a bull, and should be corrected; *Synchysis*, which is a confused

* I see not how to exemplify the figure *Synecdoche* in English, when the property of a part is ascribed to the whole, as *vultum caligine tectus*. † I am equally puzzled with *Parecon* the unnecessary enclitic, as *egomet*; and *Hendyadis* expressing one thing as two, as, *pateris libamus et auro*.

‡ *Nam nos omnes, quibus alicunde aliquis objectus est labor, Omne quod est interea tempus, prius quam id rescitum est, lucro est.*
Hecyra, act iii, s. i. v. 6, 7.

|| *Hypallage*, a mutual change of cases, as *dare classibus austros* for *austris classes*, is inapplicable to English construction.

placing of words; *Tmesis*, that divides a compound word, and interposes something; as, Do right, at what expence soever. Come your own self. *Parenthesis*, which interrupts a sentence by the insertion of a foreign clause, as What blifs (did ye but know that blifs) is yours!

THE END.

ERRATA.

P. 13 l. 1 from bot. for 137 r. 7.—p. 15 l. 11 for substantives r. substances.—p. 18 l. 14 from bot. for consonant r. consonant.
—p. 21 l. 4 for contrary r. contrary.



